

RESOLUTION

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, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on November 13, 2014 regarding Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06002-01 for Melford, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The subject application proposes to add: 2,500 residential units, including 500 townhouses, 1,000 age-restricted multifamily dwelling units, and 1,000 multifamily dwelling units; 268,500 square feet of retail uses; and 260,000 square feet of office space to a conceptual site plan (CSP) with 1,547,874 square feet of approved office/research and development uses to create an integrated mixed-use development.
2. **Development Data Summary:**

	EXISTING	APPROVED
Zone(s)	M-X-T	M-X-T
Use(s)	Commercial Office	Single-Family Attached and Multifamily Residential, Commercial Office, and Retail
Gross Acreage	276.68	276.68*
Net Acreage	225.22	225.22*
Total Dwelling Units	0	2,500
Townhomes	0	500
Age-Restricted Multifamily Units	0	1,000
Multifamily Units	0	1,000
Residential Square Footage	0	2,740,000 – 4,800,000
Commercial Office Square Footage	1,547,874*	1,807,874 (260,000 prop.)*
Commercial Retail Square Footage	0	100,000 – 268,500
Total Square Footage	1,547,874*	4,647,874 – 6,876,374*

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

Base Density Allowed	0.40
Residential	1.00
Total FAR Permitted:	1.40
Total FAR Proposed:	0.47 – 0.70*

*A condition has been included in this approval that these numbers need to be verified and calculated correctly on the CSP prior to certification. At time of the processing of the resolution the CSP acreage and gross floor area was modified to include the acreage and gross floor area associated with the hotel property, in accordance with Applicant's Exhibit #9.

3. **Location:** The subject property is located in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of Robert S. Crain Highway (MD 3) and John Hanson Highway (US 50/301), in Planning Area 71B and Council District 4.
4. **Surrounding Uses:** The site is bounded to the north by Sherwood Manor, an existing subdivision of single-family detached dwelling units in the Residential-Agricultural (R-A) Zone, and a vacant property owned by The Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) in the Reserved Open Space (R-O-S) Zone, the Patuxent River Park; to the east by the Patuxent River and the U.S. Air Force transmitter station located in Anne Arundel County; to the south by the John Hanson Highway (US 50/301) right-of-way and a small vacant property in the Open Space (O-S) Zone; and to the west by the Crain Highway (MD 3) right-of-way.
5. **Previous Approvals:** On January 25, 1982, the Prince George's County District Council approved Zoning Map Amendment (Basic Plan) A-9401 for the subject property, with ten conditions (Zoning Ordinance 2-1982). The zoning map amendment rezoned the property from the R-A and O-S Zones to the Employment and Institutional Area (E-I-A) Zone. On July 7, 1986, the District Council approved Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-8601, affirming the prior Prince George's County Planning Board decision (PGCPB Resolution No. 86-107), for the Maryland Science and Technology Center, with 27 conditions and two considerations.

The 2006 *Approved Master Plan for Bowie and Vicinity and Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Areas 71A, 71B, 74A and 74B* (Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan and SMA) rezoned the property from the E-I-A Zone to the Mixed Use-Transportation Oriented (M-X-T) Zone. The original CSP-06002 was approved by the Planning Board on January 11, 2007 which proposed a mixed-use development consisting of hotel, office, retail, restaurant, research and development, and residential (366 single-family detached and attached units and 500 multifamily units) uses. On May 11, 2009, the District Council approved Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06002 with four modifications and 29 conditions, rejecting the residential component of the proposed development. Over the years, numerous specific design plans (SDPs) and detailed site plans (DSPs) have been approved for the subject property in support of the office, flex, hotel and institutional uses, although not all have been constructed.

On May 6, 2014, the Prince George's County Council approved the *Plan Prince George's 2035 Approved General Plan* (Plan Prince George's 2035), which created new center designations to replace those found in the 2002 Prince George's County Approved General Plan, and classified the Bowie Town Center, including the subject site, as a "Town Center." The subject site retained its status as an "Employment Area" in the plan.

The site also has an approved City of Bowie Stormwater Management Concept Plan, 01-0114-207NE15, which is valid until March 10, 2017.

6. **Design Features:** The CSP proposes a mixed-use residential, retail, and commercial office development on a large property that currently has some commercial office development. The entire approximately 431-acre Melford property is located in the northeast corner of the intersection of Crain Highway (MD 3) and John Hanson Highway (US 50/301), bordered on the east by the Patuxent River environmental areas, which are now part of a large approximately 96-acre parcel dedicated to M-NCPPC for parkland per previous approvals. The one vehicular entrance to the property is via the existing, developed, public Melford Boulevard, which intersects MD 3 north of US 50/301 at a large controlled intersection. The entire area of the CSP application includes approximately 276 acres located in the central and southern portion of the Melford property and includes multiple dedicated existing public rights-of-way, including Melford Boulevard, which runs east-west, and Curie Drive, which runs north-south. The primary area of revision with the subject application is defined as “Melford Village” by the applicant. This includes the majority of the central portion of the property, surrounding the historic Melford House and cemetery, north of Melford Boulevard, on both sides of existing Curie Drive, and south of an existing stormwater management pond. The remainder of the limits of the CSP includes existing and previously approved commercial office/research and development uses to the south, west, and north that are not being revised with this application.

Melford Village will be organized around two main vehicular boulevards, a new boulevard running east-west, north of Melford House and Melford Boulevard; and the other, Curie Drive, running north-south, which will be modified in the future in regard to alignment and road section as part of this development. Four neighborhoods are created by the two main boulevards: the northwest neighborhood, southwest neighborhood, southeast neighborhood, and northeast neighborhood, along with the commercial district on the west side of Melford Boulevard. Where the two main boulevards intersect, a village plaza is proposed that will include a monumental feature and serve as a focal point to Melford Village. The east-west boulevard is proposed to terminate on the eastern end at an amphitheater adjacent to an existing stormwater pond that is to become an amenity feature.

The 260,000 square feet of commercial office space and 268,500 square feet of commercial retail space is concentrated at the western end of Melford Village, surrounding the new east-west boulevard (just to the east and north of Melford Boulevard), west, north and south of Melford House. A small portion of proposed commercial space is located on the west side of Melford Boulevard near existing office buildings. The remainder of the Melford Village area, to the east of Melford House, surrounding the north-south boulevard and extending to the M-NCPPC parkland to the east, is proposed to include 2,500 residential dwelling units, including multifamily units and a maximum of 20 percent single-family attached units. The CSP also specifies that a minimum of 20 percent of the 2,500 units will be senior housing, although this is an applicant proffer and not required by the Zoning Ordinance.

The CSP application does not include a list of specific proposed private recreational facilities on-site, but rather identifies potential amenity spaces and opportunity areas within each neighborhood area. These include plazas; special facilities, such as fitness centers and pools; resource parks, such as historic and natural areas; pocket parks; waterfront parks around the existing stormwater management ponds; and senior amenities within the senior multifamily buildings.

The CSP application included a 67-page “Melford Village Design Guidelines” book that discusses various design-related standards and plans for the property. Below is a summary of the book’s important items:

Community Principles & Forms

This section includes all of the plans and illustrations for the CSP. It starts with a description of Melford and the region and then provides the CSP map as described above. Organizing patterns of the boulevards, neighborhoods, and natural amenities are mapped that then lead to the illustrative site plan provided with the CSP. A map shows the variety of residential and commercial buildings proposed and discusses the intent to provide retail and commercial uses on the ground level of all buildings along the boulevards. Subsequent maps show the proposed pedestrian network, including sidewalks, trails, and bicycle routes; possible opportunity areas for public spaces or special designs; and the proposed green space network, including plazas, pocket parks, and senior amenities, among others. A street network map designates proposed primary, secondary, and tertiary routes followed by proposed typical street sections. It should be noted that these street sections are conceptual at this stage and subject to final approval with the subsequent required preliminary plan of subdivision when a specific layout is proposed and full adequacy of facilities can be determined. A condition regarding this issue has been included in this approval. The Parking Standards section is discussed further in Finding 7e below. However, it should be noted that this section states that the minimum size for a perpendicular parking space will be 18 by 9 feet, which will require a departure. This statement should be removed as it cannot be presumed that such a departure would be approved at the time of DSP. A condition regarding this issue has been included in this approval.

The Sustainability and Planning section describes the principles of Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design for Neighborhood Development (LEED-ND) that have been incorporated into the CSP.

Neighborhood Patterns

This section describes the four neighborhoods to be created by the two main boulevards: the northwest neighborhood, southwest neighborhood, southeast neighborhood, and northeast neighborhood, along with the commercial district on the west side of Melford Boulevard. The neighborhood requirements, key features, and the proposed development patterns are described. These aspects of the plan will be further developed in the required preliminary plan and DSP for the site.

Architectural Principles and Forms

This section includes a list of architectural design standards intended to ensure high-quality design and materials on all of the buildings throughout Melford Village. Another section sets forth the minimum frontage build-out requirements along the main east-west boulevard, as well as a description of its cross-section in relation to the building height-to-street width ratio. The final sections describe the various building forms proposed, including multifamily villas, townhomes, wrap buildings, specialty buildings, retail village, and clubhouses and recreation. Descriptions of the building forms are provided along with diagrams specifying setbacks and parking locations.

Melford House Preservation & Rehabilitation

This section details the general site design for the area around the historic Melford House and the intended protection of two view corridors, one between the house and the historic cemetery on-site and one between the house and the lower pond to the east. Ultimately, any work within the environmental settings of the house or cemetery will require and be subject to historic area work permits, which will require review by the Prince George's County Historic Preservation Commission. Additionally, any development in areas adjacent to the environmental settings will be subject to review and comment by Historic Preservation staff for their impacts.

Landscape Principles & Forms

This section details the landscape design standards the applicant proposes for Melford Village. This is discussed further in relation to conformance with the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* (Landscape Manual) in Finding 9 below. Additionally, there are sections regarding streetscape design, signage design, and lighting design standards. The street design standards set guidelines for a pedestrian space system including sidewalks, transit facilities, sidewalk cafés, and street furniture. The signage design standards set guidelines for building-mounted and freestanding signage in Melford Village only, and not for other existing and approved development within the limits of the CSP. It also states that all signage shall conform to the Zoning Ordinance. The lighting design standards set guidelines for attractive ornamental lighting that will help ensure safe lighting of the development.

Design Review Committee Policies & Procedures

This section details the Melford Village Design Review Committee (DRC) and its policies and procedures, which the applicant intends to create to enforce the minimum design standards for Melford Village. The applicant intends for the DRC to review proposals prior to seeking approval from the City of Bowie and Prince George's County. While this could be a helpful process for the applicant to maintain their desired quality of development, the Planning Board cannot require or enforce such an arrangement, or its policies or procedures. The DRC will also not replace the official city or county processes required for any new development within the limits of the CSP. Therefore, this section should be moved to an appendix in the book and be clearly labeled as such. Introductory language should be provided stating that this section was created by the applicant for their own use and is not endorsed or required by the Planning Board. A condition regarding this issue has been included in this approval.

Definitions

This section includes two pages of words and definitions, some of which are specific to this CSP, such as “village office,” and others that are already defined in the Zoning Ordinance, such as “alley.” This section should be moved to an appendix in the book and be clearly labeled as such. Introductory language should be provided stating that this section does not modify Zoning Ordinance definitions and is not endorsed by the Planning Board, but provided by the applicant for clarification purposes only. A condition regarding this issue has been included in this approval.

Appendices

This section includes two parts, one regarding recommended plants and sizes and one regarding parking rationale. The plants and sizes list is conceptually acceptable; however, specific information, in conformance with the Landscape Manual, will have to be provided regarding all plantings at the time of each DSP. The parking rationale issue is discussed further in Finding 7e below.

7. **Zoning Ordinance:** The subject application has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements of the M-X-T Zone and the site plan design guidelines of the Zoning Ordinance.
 - a. The subject application is in conformance with the requirements of Section 27-547 of the Zoning Ordinance, which governs uses in mixed-use zones.
 - (1) All types of office and research, many types of retail, and eating and drinking establishments are permitted in the M-X-T Zone. The submitted CSP proposes office and retail space and residential development.

Residential uses are permitted in the M-X-T Zone, with the following footnote:

Section 27-547(b), Footnote 7

Except as provided in Section 27-544(b), for development pursuant to a Detailed Site Plan for which an application is filed after December 30, 1996, the number of townhouses shall not exceed 20% of the total number of dwelling units in the total development. This townhouse restriction 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.

Section 27-544(b) does not apply to the subject application, nor is the subject property within one-half mile of an existing or planned Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) transit rail station site. Therefore, the 20 percent restriction on townhouses applies to the subject application. The CSP proposes exactly 20 percent townhouses with 500 townhouses of the total 2,500 residential units.

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

Section 27-547(d)

(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.**

All three use categories are proposed in the subject CSP which exceeds the requirements of Section 27-547(d).

- b. Section 27-548, M-X-T Zone regulations, establishes additional standards for the 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;
and**
- (2) With the use of the optional method of development—8.0 FAR**

The applicant has proposed to use the optional method of development. Under the optional method of development, greater densities can be granted in increments up to a maximum floor area ratio (FAR) of eight for each of the uses, improvements, and amenities. The uses, improvements, and amenities proposed in this CSP include:

- Residential—This will potentially increase the FAR by 1.0 if more than 20 dwelling units are provided with the application. This CSP proposes a total of 2,500 dwelling units and is eligible for this bonus.

The CSP proposes the use of the optional method of development and has a FAR above 0.40. The proposed FAR is as follows:

Uses	Square footage
Residential	2,740,000 – 4,800,000
Commercial	1,907,874 – 2,076,374
Total	4,647,874 – 6,876,374
Net Site Area: 225.22 Acres	9,810,583
FAR	0.47 – 0.70

The development will need to use the optional method of development, such as the proposed residential units, to achieve the FAR proposed, which is above 0.40.

- (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 CSP proposes more than one building on more than one lot as allowed.

- (c) **Except as provided for in this Division, the dimensions for the location, coverage, and height of all improvements shown on an approved Detailed Site Plan shall constitute the regulations for these improvements for a specific development in the M-X-T Zone.**

This requirement is applicable at the time of the future DSP. The subject CSP application includes a design guidelines book which offers some guidelines for future improvements, but no specific regulations. This is discussed more in Finding 6 above.

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

The subject development is subject to the requirements of the Landscape Manual. The site's compliance with the requirements of the Landscape Manual will be reviewed at the time of DSP. However, the subject application includes a design guidelines book that lists some regulations for proposed landscaping. This is discussed further in Finding 9 below relative to conformance with the Landscape Manual.

- (e) **In addition to those areas of a building included in the computation of gross floor area (without the use of the optional method of development), the floor area of the following improvements (using the optional method of development) shall be included in computing the gross floor area of the**

building of which they are a part: enclosed pedestrian spaces, theaters, and residential uses. Floor area ratios shall exclude from gross floor area that area in a building or structure devoted to vehicular parking and parking access areas (notwithstanding the provisions of Section 27-107.01). The floor area ratio shall be applied to the entire property which is the subject of the Conceptual Site Plan.

This requirement will be reviewed for compliance at the time of DSP when detailed building designs are provided; however, the CSP complies with this requirement.

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

This requirement will be reviewed for compliance at the time of DSP; however, the CSP does not show any private structures above or below public rights-of-way.

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

This requirement will be reviewed at the time of DSP once access and lotting patterns are evaluated and approved with the required preliminary plan. The CSP allows for the possibility of largely private streets throughout the development; this may require variations at the time of preliminary plan, which may or may not be approved. Access to historic sites should be arranged via public streets. Additionally, Subtitle 24 of the Prince George's County Code requires that multifamily dwellings be served by public streets.

- (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 1,800 square feet in size, and shall have at least 60 percent of the full front façades constructed of brick, stone, or stucco...**

The regulations regarding townhouse design will be enforced at the time of preliminary plan and DSP as required. However, the applicant expressed their intent to comply with the requirements of this section.

- (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, or a Mixed-Use Planned Community.**

The CSP does not propose any building higher than 110 feet, but this requirement will be enforced at the time of DSP.

- c. The subject application is in conformance with the requirements of Section 27-546(d) of the Zoning Ordinance, which requires findings in addition to the findings required for the Planning Board to approve a CSP as follows:

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

The purposes of the M-X-T Zone as stated in Section 27-542(a) include the following:

(1) To promote the orderly development and redevelopment of land in the vicinity of major interchanges, major intersections, and major transit stops, so that these areas will enhance the economic status of the County and provide an expanding source of desirable employment and living opportunities for its citizens;

The subject site was rezoned from the E-I-A Zone to the M-X-T Zone pursuant to the 2006 Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan and SMA. Page 121 of the master plan recommended M-X-T zoning on the subject site “to promote development and redevelopment of land in the vicinity of a major interchange (US 50 and US 301), with an emphasis on a moderate- to high-density mix of office/employment/retail/hotel, residential, and parkland/open space uses.” The subject proposal is in keeping with the recommendations of the rezoning. The area of the Melford CSP also includes employment uses and proposed residential uses, which will provide desirable employment and living opportunities.

(2) To implement recommendations in the approved General Plan, Master Plans, and Sector Plans, by creating compact, mixed-use, walkable communities enhanced by a mix of residential, commercial, recreational, open space, employment, and institutional uses;

The applicant proposed a walkable mixed-use community with a mix of office, commercial, and residential uses and recreational spaces. The proposal implements the recommendations of a town center and employment area as contained in Plan Prince George’s 2035, and implements numerous strategies contained in the Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan, as discussed in the body of this report.

(3) To conserve the value of land and buildings by maximizing the public and private development potential inherent in the location of the zone, which might otherwise become scattered throughout and outside the County, to its detriment;

The proposal will provide a concentration of uses in an area that is designated as both a town center and employment area, maximizing the development potential of the property.

- (4) To promote the effective and optimum use of transit and reduce automobile use by locating a mix of residential and non-residential uses in proximity to one another and to transit facilities to facilitate walking, bicycle, and transit use;**

The applicant testifies and the Planning Board finds that the CSP proposes using the principles of LEED ND (Neighborhood Design) to achieve energy efficiencies and neighborhood conservation. By locating residences and jobs proximate to each other, this neighborhood planning concept incorporates sustainable design elements that encourage walking, bicycling, and the future potential for public transportation (i.e. bus service) for daily commuting.

The applicant testified that preliminary discussions have been held between the City of Bowie, the applicant and WMATA regarding the provision of bus service to Melford Village. As the overall development begins to take shape and acquire the requisite density needed for the establishment of public bus service, the applicant states that they will continue dialogue with the City of Bowie and WMATA to facilitate bus service to the development. During subsequent development applications, WMATA will be consulted prior to final road design to determine the logical potential bus route and plan lane widths and bus stop locations accordingly.

While bus service is not necessary for transportation adequacy, future bus service would be a benefit to future residents, employers, and employees. Future bus service, if determined to be feasible, could provide connections between the subject site and other area destinations such as Bowie Town Center, New Carrollton, and Crofton. The Planning Board also finds that at time of preliminary plan of subdivision, the applicant should evaluate the provision of a circulator or shuttle bus throughout Melford that might connect the site area destinations, major employers, commuter bus lots, and/or mass transit.

- (5) To facilitate and encourage a twenty-four (24) hour environment to ensure continuing functioning of the project after workday hours through a maximum of activity, and the interaction between the uses and those who live, work in, or visit the area;**

The existing Melford property includes office, research, and development uses only. By adding residential and commercial uses, the CSP encourages a 24-hour environment.

(6) To encourage an appropriate horizontal and vertical mix of land uses which blend together harmoniously;

The applicant testified and the Planning Board finds that the mixed-use proposal would not be possible had not the County determined during the 2006 Bowie and Vicinity SMA that the M-X-T Zone would assist in implementing the envisioned re-positioning of Melford from strictly an employment park to a vibrant mixed-use and pedestrian oriented community.

The area of the CSP revision includes up to 2,500 residential units, 260,000 square feet of office space, and up to 268,500 square feet of retail space. This will be added to 1,547,874 square feet of approved and/or constructed employment uses within the boundary of the CSP. This represents a mix of uses which should operate harmoniously.

(7) To create dynamic, functional relationships among individual uses within a distinctive visual character and identity;

The functional relationships of the individual uses are established with the subject CSP, and will be further reviewed at the time of DSP. The visual character and identity of the project will be a function of the architecture of the buildings, entrance features, and landscape plantings which will be under close examination at the time of DSP review. Buildings should be designed with high-quality detailing and design variation. They should be appropriate in scale with their location. The architecture, street furniture, landscape treatment, signage, and other elements should be coordinated to give the development a distinctive visual character. The applicant's provided guidelines establish an appropriate standard for the development.

(8) To promote optimum land planning with greater efficiency through the use of economies of scale, savings in energy, innovative stormwater management techniques, and provision of public facilities and infrastructure beyond the scope of single-purpose projects;

The proposal has been designed as an energy-efficient multipurpose plan. To further support this finding, the CSP has been designed in accordance with LEED-ND principles.

(9) To permit a flexible response to the market and promote economic vitality and investment; and

The CSP is in general conformance with this purpose of the M-X-T Zone. Melford is currently a somewhat one-dimensional employment area. By adding

uses that do not currently exist on the property, the applicant will be able to respond with more flexibility to the market in the future.

- (10) To allow freedom of architectural design in order to provide an opportunity and incentive to the developer to achieve excellence in physical, social, and economic planning.**

As approved with conditions and DSP review, the applicant will be allowed freedom in architectural design to provide a unique and attractive product for the area.

- (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 pursuant to the 2006 Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan and SMA; therefore, this required finding does not apply.

- (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 subject property is located at the intersection of two freeways (MD 3 and US 50/301). To the north of the M-X-T-zoned property is Sherwood Manor, a single-family detached development. To the west of the subject site across MD 3 are the Buckingham at Belair and Kenilworth at Belair subdivisions within the City of Bowie. The CSP shows office, a hotel, and research and development along the perimeter of the adjacent roadways. Due to the size and location of the proposal, it is largely self-contained. Physical integration with neighborhoods outside of Melford is a challenge; nevertheless, the applicant indicates that a pedestrian connection along Melford Boulevard to the adjacent development on the west side of MD 3 will be established (subject to approval by the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA)) to physically connect Melford to nearby residential neighborhoods. The City of Bowie also recommends a condition to this effect that will be further evaluated at the time of preliminary plan.

The proposed neighborhoods within Melford Village, as represented in the design guidelines, will have an outward orientation and will be well integrated with the existing employment uses on the site. The proposed addition of commercial and residential uses and amenity spaces is intended to catalyze the improvement and rejuvenation of all of Melford.

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

From the time of the rezoning of the subject site to the M-X-T Zone, the Melford property has been planned for a moderate- to high-density mix of office, employment, retail, hotel, residential, and parkland/open space uses, which is currently proposed. The Planning Board found with the approved original Conceptual Site Plan, CSP-06002, that the proposal was in conformance with the applicable purposes. The Planning Board found that, with the subject revision to add residential, commercial, and office uses, the proposal remains compatible with existing and proposed development in the vicinity.

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

The Planning Board finds that the submitted CSP and design guidelines for Melford Village establish the framework for a quality development planned in accordance with LEED-ND principles that is capable of sustaining an independent environment of continuing quality and stability. The arrangement and design of buildings and other improvements will continue to be evaluated with future plan approvals to ensure that the proposal remains consistent with the finding above.

(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 applicant indicates that the development will be phased according to market conditions. More specific phasing information has not been provided. Phasing information should be provided as available, but no later than the first DSP within Melford Village. This phasing information may be revised with future applications. Each building phase should be designed as a self-sufficient entity while also allowing for effective integration with subsequent construction phases.

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

The CSP is comprehensively designed to encourage pedestrian activity within the development. The development will include sidewalks and connections to a larger trail network.

(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 subject application is a CSP.

- (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, or will be provided by the applicant, 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.**

This requirement is applicable to this CSP as it was rezoned from the E-I-A Zone to the M-X-T Zone by the 2006 Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan and SMA. Consequently, a traffic study is required for this application. The applicant prepared a traffic impact study dated May 30, 2014, in accordance with the methodologies in the “Transportation Review Guidelines, Part 1” (Guidelines). The study was referred to the Prince George’s County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T), SHA, and the City of Bowie. The proposed development generally meets the code requirements, provided that the development does not exceed 4,441 AM and 4,424 PM peak hour trips and that all of the associated improvements proffered are fully implemented.

Additional supporting information is as follows:

- (1) The overall Melford property is approximately 431.55 acres of land in the M-X-T Zone. Based on the mix of uses being proposed, the development would generate a net total (after discounting pass-by trips and internally captured trips) of 1,834 (897 in; 937 out) AM peak hour trips, and 2,516 (1,224 in; 1,292 out) PM peak hour trips. These trip projections were determined using the “Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposal,” as well as the Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition (Institute of Transportation Engineers).
- (2) The traffic generated by the proposed conceptual plan would impact the following intersections:
 - MD 3 & MD 450-gas station
 - Belair Drive & Ramp from MD 3 southbound
 - Belair Drive & Ramp to/from MD 3 northbound
 - US 301 & Gov. Bridge Road-Harbor Way

- Melford Boulevard & Science Drive (Roundabout)
- Melford Boulevard & Telsa Drive-site entrance
- Melford Boulevard & Telsa Drive-Curie Drive (Roundabout)
- Curie & Science Drive (Roundabout)

(3) None of the intersections identified in (2) above is programmed for improvement with 100 percent construction funding within the next six years in the current Maryland Department of Transportation Consolidated Transportation Program (CTP) or the Prince George's County Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

(4) The subject property is located within Transportation Service Area (TSA) 2, as defined in Plan Prince George's 2035. As such, the subject property is evaluated according to the following standards:

Links and signalized intersections: Level-of-service (LOS) E, with signalized intersections operating at a critical lane volume (CLV) of 1,600 or better.

Unsignalized intersections: *The Highway Capacity Manual* procedure for unsignalized intersections is not a true test of adequacy, but rather an indicator that further operational studies need to be conducted. Vehicle delay in any movement exceeding 50.0 seconds is deemed an unacceptable operating condition at unsignalized intersections. In response to such a finding, the Planning Board has generally recommended that the applicant provide a traffic signal warrant study and install the signal (or other less costly warranted traffic controls) if deemed warranted by the appropriate operating agency.

Roundabouts: Analyses indicating volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratio that is less than 0.850 are considered to be acceptable.

(5) The following intersections identified in (2) above, when analyzed with the total future traffic as developed using the Guidelines, were not found to be operating at or better than the policy service level defined in (4) above:

- MD 3 & MD 450-gas station
- Melford Boulevard & Science Drive (Roundabout)

(6) The applicant has agreed to provide the following improvements to the intersections, in consideration of the findings in (5) above:

MD 3/MD 450/Gas Station Access intersection

- Provide a fourth northbound and southbound through lane (which is already implemented).

Melford Boulevard & Science Drive

- Convert the existing roundabout to a traditional four-legged signalized intersection.

(7) ALL of the intersections identified in (2) above, when analyzed with the improvements identified in (6) above and total future traffic as developed using the Guidelines, were found to be operating at or better than the policy service level defined in (4) above.

- (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 approved by the applicant.**

This requirement is not applicable to this CSP.

- (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.**

A mixed-use planned community is not proposed.

- d. As approved with conditions, the CSP is in conformance with the applicable CSP site design guidelines contained in Section 27-274. The following discussion is offered:

- (1) Section 27-274(a)(2)(A), Parking, loading, and circulation, provides guidelines for the design of surface parking facilities. Surface parking lots are encouraged to be located to the rear or side of structures to minimize the visual impact of cars on the site. The subject CSP is in general conformance with this requirement. The illustrative site plan shows that, in general, surface parking is not proposed between buildings and the public rights-of-way. Additionally, the Melford Village

Design Guidelines book specifies that, where practicable, parking shall be located to the rear or sides of buildings.

- (2) In accordance with Section 27-274(a)(2)(B), loading areas should be visually unobtrusive. Loading areas are not indicated on the CSP or the provided illustrative site plan. However, the Melford Village Design Guidelines book specifies that service areas, loading docks, and trash dumpsters shall be screened from the public view. At the time of DSP, attention should be paid to the design of loading areas so that they are visually unobtrusive as viewed from public spaces and the public right-of-way.
- (3) In accordance with Section 27-274(a)(5)(A), green areas on-site should be appropriate in size, shape, location, and design. The Melford Village Design Guidelines book provides a green network map that shows a variety of types of green spaces spread throughout all four neighborhoods. At the time of DSP, attention should be paid to the specific design of these areas to make sure they are easily accessible, well-defined, and appropriately scaled for the area they are to serve.
- (4) In accordance with Section 27-274(a)(6)(A), Site and streetscape amenities, the coordination of the design of light fixtures, benches, trash receptacles, bicycle racks, and other street furniture will be required. A comprehensive review of streetscape amenities will occur at the time of DSP. However, the Melford Village Design Guidelines book indicates that these features will be integral elements of the streetscape and will be coordinated throughout Melford Village.
- (5) A public space system should be provided to enhance the commercial and multifamily development areas in accordance with Section 27-274(a)(9), Public spaces. It is specified that these public spaces should incorporate high-quality design details and be integrated into the site design by a well-designed pedestrian system. An attractive mix of design features including focal points, such as public art, sculpture, or fountains; seating areas; specialty landscaping; and specialty paving materials should be provided throughout the spaces. The Melford Village Design Guidelines book indicates that a well-designed public space system will be provided; however, this will be fully evaluated at the time of DSP.
- (6) As discussed in Section 27-274(a)(10), architecture should provide a variety of building forms, with a unified harmonious use of materials and styles. The Melford Village Design Guidelines book includes an extensive list of architectural design standards and indicates approximately six different types of building forms that should help to ensure a quality mix is provided at the time of DSP.
- (7) As discussed in Section 27-274(a)(11)(B), it is noted that groups of townhouses should be arranged at right angles to each other in a courtyard design and units

should front on roadways. The submitted CSP does show such an arrangement in the majority of the townhouse areas, and this should be maintained in the future preliminary plan and DSP.

- e. In accordance with Section 27-574 of the 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 requirement is outlined in Section 24-574(b).

The design guidelines book submitted as part of the CSP included parking standards (page 17) and a parking rationale appendix (page 67). The first section includes various guidelines regarding parking location and design, but also includes a specific minimum recommended parking ratio table and a detailed shared parking adjustment table. Not only is this information not required at the time of CSP, it is premature to evaluate it now when exact use types, amounts, and locations, along with other final site improvements, are unknown. Additionally, the parking rationale provided does not follow the methodology prescribed in Section 27-574 for calculating the proposed parking. Therefore, the parking ratio table and shared parking adjustment table were not evaluated for their merits at this time. These tables, in the second column of page 17, shall be moved to an appendix in the design guidelines book, along with the provided parking rationale. Then, it shall be clearly labeled as an appendix and include an opening statement that the provided information is the developer's preferred proposed parking amounts, but that final parking determination will be made at the time of DSP when full methodology, assumptions, and data, per Section 27-574 of the Zoning Ordinance, must be submitted. A condition regarding this issue has been included in this approval.

8. **Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06002:** Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06002 was approved by the District Council on May 11, 2009 for the construction of a mixed-use development consisting of hotel, office, retail, restaurant, research, and development uses. The conditions of CSP-06002 are below, followed by comment. The Planning Board finds that the conditions of the subject approval entirely supersede those contained in CSP-06002.

1. **Total development within the subject property shall be limited to uses within the M-X-T Zone that generate no more than 2,774 AM or 3,593 PM peak-hour vehicle trips. No development with an impact beyond those limits may be approved, until the applicant revises the CSP and the Planning Board and District Council make a new determination that transportation facilities will be adequate for proposed uses. The applicant shall prepare and file another traffic analysis, to support a finding of adequacy.**

Subsequent to the previous CSP approval, the current applicant has brought to the attention of staff that, during the review and including the previous approval, there were some background developments that were not included in the traffic study that was the basis for the analyses and

subsequent approval of CSP-06002. That omission could have had an impact on the actual trip cap which became a part of the approval by the Planning Board. To address this issue, the applicant has prepared a technical memorandum (September 2013) which included an agreed-upon amount of background developments, as well as a sensitivity analysis, to determine the full effect of the corrected background developments, as well as establishing a new trip cap.

In reviewing this technical memorandum, it was concluded that all of the development contained within the umbrella of approved CSP-06002 would generate 4,498 AM and 4,475 PM peak hour trips. In light of the fact that many of the background developments are in various stages of development, the applicant determined that the actual trip cap of the areas covered by the subject application (CSP-06002-01) would be 4,441 AM and 4,424 PM peak hour trips. It was also demonstrated that the subsequent improvements that were provided by the applicant were sufficient to mitigate at least 150 percent of the new traffic being proposed under CSP-06002. The Planning Board concurred with the findings and conclusions of the applicant's technical memorandum.

The Planning Board finds that the above trip cap condition be replaced with the new trip cap of 4,441 AM and 4,424 PM peak hour trips.

2. **Prior to issuance of any building permits for lots that have not been recorded, except for Lot 3, where the proposed police communication center is to be constructed, 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) **At the MD 3/MD 450/gas station access intersection:**

The applicant shall provide an additional northbound and southbound through lane. Pursuant to SHA requirements, the additional southbound through lane shall begin at the Patuxent River Bridge and shall extend 2,000 feet south of MD 450. The additional northbound through lane shall begin 2,000 feet south of MD 450 and shall extend to the Patuxent River Bridge, north of MD 450.

(B) **At the US 301/Gov. Bridge Road/Harbor Way intersection:**

The applicant shall provide an additional exclusive left turn lane on the eastbound approach. The overall lane use for this approach shall be two left turn lanes and a shared left-through-right lane.

Governors Bridge Road shall be widened, and a left-turn lane shall be added, as recommended by DPW&T. Because of the short right-turn-only lane, the widening shall extend from the intersection of US 301 to the

apartment complex driveway, and the entire roadway shall be restriped, to provide two outbound lanes for approximately 250 feet, all as recommended by DPW&T.

The above transportation improvements have been constructed. The Planning Board finds that this condition has been satisfied.

3. The site plans shall be revised to delineate and note both the Environmental Setting and the Impact Area for Melford, Historic Site 71B-016.

The applicant shall correct the notations on all site plans to include the following text: “Melford and Cemetery Environmental Setting (Historic Site 71B-016).”

4. Applicable detailed site plans that may affect the historic vista of the Melford House shall demonstrate that proposed buildings do not obstruct the vista.

The Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) recommended the following revised language for existing Condition 4 to clarify what is meant by the historic vista, and how it might be protected, as follows:

“Applicable detailed site plans that may affect the historic vista of the Melford and Cemetery Historic Site shall demonstrate that any portion of a proposed building, either partially or fully within the designated view corridors established in CSP-06002-01, comply with the height requirements for buildings within the view corridors set forth in the design guidelines.”

The CSP contains two view corridors. One connects the Melford house and the historic cemetery, within which no building construction should be permitted. Just outside of that primary view corridor, one-story buildings are permitted. The second view corridor is directed east from Melford house to the proposed East-West Boulevard and the amphitheater. Within this second view corridor, the applicant has proffered building height restrictions. The recommended language, which the Planning Board adopts, clarifies which views shall be protected and establishes techniques for the protection of the views within the defined view corridors.

5. Before approval of any detailed site plans, the applicant shall demonstrate that plans for new construction within the impact review area follow the guidelines on page 91 of the CDP-8601 document for the former Maryland Science and Technology Center.

The HPC recommended the following revised language for existing Condition 5 to eliminate the reference to a 1986 comprehensive design plan, which has little current regulatory bearing on the subject site, and is difficult to research due to the age and condition of the CDP document. The content of the referenced language has been evaluated and the language below retains the original intent.

“Prior to approval of any detailed site plans that include any portion of the Melford and Cemetery Historic Site (71B-016) environmental setting and impact review area, the applicant shall demonstrate that the scale, mass, proportion, materials, and architecture for new construction in the proposed northwest and southwest neighborhoods appropriately relate to the character of the historic site.”

- 6. Before M-NCPPC accepts a detailed site plan application for this property, the applicant in the historic area work permit process shall present a plan and timetable for the protection, stabilization, restoration, and planned adaptive use of the buildings and gardens of the Melford Historic Site. The Historic Preservation Commission and Planning Board shall review and approve the plan and timetable, in the HAWP process, before approval of the first DSP.**

The applicant requests modifications to the above language, which the HPC believe is appropriate, as follows:

“Prior to Planning Board approval of the first detailed site plan for development in the northwest or southwest neighborhood(s) of Melford Village, the applicant in the historic area work permit process shall submit a plan and timetable for the protection, stabilization, restoration, and planned adaptive use of the buildings and gardens of the Melford and Cemetery Historic Site. The Historic Preservation Commission shall review and approve the plan and timetable through the Historic Area Work Permit (HAWP) process.”

The modified condition clarifies the timing for the submission of a plan and timetable for the protection, stabilization, restoration, and planned adaptive use of the buildings and gardens of the Melford and Cemetery historic site. Because the plan and timetable will be approved through the Historic Area Work Permit (HAWP) process, it is appropriate to leave the review and approval under the authority of HPC, and not the Planning Board, in accordance with the standard HAWP process.

- 7. In the detailed site plan for the development of the Melford Historic Site, its outbuildings, and its cemetery, the proposed development shall be compatible in scale, design, and character with the existing historical and architectural character of the buildings. Sensitive and innovative site design techniques, such as careful siting, variation in orientation, roof shape, building materials, screening, landscaping, berming, and open space, should be incorporated into the proposal, to minimize adverse impacts to the historic site.**

This condition should be carried forward to all subsequent DSP applications.

- 8. Prior to issuance of building permits for any property within CSP-06002, the applicant shall initiate the restoration of the Melford House and outbuildings, through the historic area work permit process. The restoration of Melford and**

outbuildings shall be completed prior to issuance of use and occupancy permits for any future hotel or office uses.

Based on the completion of work associated with HAWP 5-07 and HAWP 45-07, reviewed and approved by HPC, substantial rehabilitation of Melford House and its outbuildings has been completed to a residential standard. This condition is no longer necessary. Any future rehabilitation of the historic site for a nonresidential use will be carried out through another HAWP as recommended by the modified language of Condition 6 (above).

- 9. Prior to approval of any preliminary plan or detailed site plan applications, the Historic Preservation Section shall certify that all quarterly reports have been received in a timely manner and that the Melford site is being properly maintained.**

This condition remains in effect, and the Planning Board finds that it be carried forward with the subject approval.

- 10. The applicant shall provide standard sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads, in keeping with guideline 3 of CR-11-2006. In areas of high pedestrian activity, wide sidewalks shall be required. The project shall be pedestrian-friendly, with keen detail for a walkable community.**

Sidewalks are reflected along both sides of all internal roads in the CSP. Wide sidewalks are provided along commercial areas and other areas of higher density.

- 11. Curb extensions, curb cuts, crosswalks, pedestrian refuges, and other pedestrian safety features shall be provided where appropriate, and shall be shown on all affected DSPs.**

Pedestrian safety features, bicycle parking, and other amenities will be addressed at the time of DSP. However, a comprehensive network of sidewalk and trail connections is reflected on the submitted CSP.

- 12. Connector trails shall be provided to complement the sidewalk network and provide access between uses and development pods. Priority shall be given to providing trail and sidewalk access to the existing trail around the Lower Pond. The comprehensive trail network will be evaluated at the time of preliminary plan and should be in conformance with guidelines 29 and 30 of CR-11-2006.**

A trail is proposed along the Patuxent River stream valley, including the area of the lower pond. Two trail connections are reflected on the submitted plans that connect the development site to the stream valley trail. In addition to the trail connections, a comprehensive network of sidewalks is reflected and a partial grid street network is proposed, further enhancing and promoting pedestrian access.

As indicated by the prior conditions of approval, County Council Resolution CR-11-2006 contained a number of design standards and guidelines related to the Melford property. The standards and guidelines pertaining to trail or pedestrian access are copied below:

- (3) The Conceptual Site Plan shall have an integrated network of streets, sidewalks (on all streets), and open space, public or private, and shall give priority to public space and appropriate placement of uses.**
- (5) The community shall contain additional linked open space in the form of squares, greens, parks, and trails that are accessible, safe and comfortable. The open space should provide a variety of visual and physical experiences. Some of these open spaces should be bordered by buildings and be visible from streets and buildings.**
- (29) Community recreational facilities shall take full advantage of environmental features on and adjacent to the property, and shall include extensive trail and boardwalk systems. These recreational facilities may also include educational features for the general public and public schools, such as kiosks along the trails, boardwalks at observation points, and education stations, with curriculum available to schools for use in specific locations.**
- (30) The open space system, including but not limited to environmentally sensitive areas, shall extend through the site and link the uses. Portions of the open space system shall be visible to and accessible from public streets.**

The submitted CSP appears to be consistent with the above-referenced standards and guidelines. A comprehensive network of sidewalks is proposed, as is the master plan trail along the Patuxent River and connections to the master plan trail from the proposed development. Additional areas of open space also appear to be provided, as well as various plazas and urban parks, as indicated on the Green Network exhibit. The open space appears to be accessible and visible from adjacent roadways and buildings, and the sidewalk network appears to provide pedestrian access throughout the site and to all of the appropriate destinations.

- 13. The illustrative plan provided with the CSP is for illustrative purposes only and does not reflect the final layout for any purpose, including limits of disturbance. The CSP may be used as a guide for the layout to be reviewed with the preliminary plan of subdivision or detailed site plans, but its proposed development should be modified, where development shown in the CSP is not consistent with environmental or other Master Plan considerations.**

The applicant has submitted new illustrative plans for Melford. These illustrative plans are for guidance and informational purposes. The above condition remains in effect.

- 14. Prior to signature approval of the CSP and TCP I, the TCP I shall be revised as follows:**
- a. Revise the shading patterns so that the information underneath is legible;**
 - b. Eliminate the pattern used to depict previously approved limits of disturbance and show only the limit of disturbance needed for the proposed development;**
 - c. Eliminate all clearing not necessary for the conceptual construction of the features shown;**
 - d. Revise the existing tree line per Staff Exhibit A (2006 Aerial);**
 - e. Provide labels on each cleared area, with acreage and land pod identifications; if cleared areas cross pods, divide them up so that the table on Sheet 1 can be checked for correctness;**
 - f. Revise the worksheet to reflect all cleared areas, preservation areas, etc.;**
 - g. Revise the table on Sheet 1 to fill in all the boxes;**
 - h. Add the following note: “This TCP I is associated with the approval of CSP-06002; it is conceptual in nature, and is subject to further revisions with the preliminary plan of subdivision application”;**
 - i. Revise the plans to address all other staff comments of record; and**
 - j. Have the revised plans signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared them.**

The above conditions were addressed prior to certification of the original CSP. This condition is not relevant to the subject approval.

- 15. Prior to signature approval of the CSP, and at least 30 days prior to any hearing on the preliminary plan, the CSP and TCP I shall be revised to remove all buildings, roads, trails, and other amenities from the 100-foot natural buffer for streams and the 150-foot buffer for the 100-year floodplain.**

Prior to certification of the CSP, revisions were made for all of the listed features, except for the master-planned trail proposed on park land and two connections from the internal trail system to the master-planned system. These trail connections were allowed per Condition 29b of CSP-06002. The Planning Board adopts the following replacement condition:

At the time of preliminary plan review and subsequent development applications, the 100-foot natural buffer for streams and the 150-foot buffer for the 100-year floodplain shall be retained in an undisturbed or restored state to the fullest extent possible, except for impacts approved by the Planning Board. Master-planned trails and connectors to the master plan trail from interior trail networks shall be allowed subject to minimization of impacts.

- 16. Except for previously approved clearing that directly relates to the construction of the stormwater management ponds, all disturbance to the stream and floodplain buffers shall be eliminated. Where buffers have been disturbed by previous approvals, they shall be reforested, wherever possible. The TCP I associated with the preliminary plan will be evaluated for impacts to these buffers for the installation of stormwater management outfalls, as necessary. The 150-foot building setback shall be shown on the plans, and the applicant shall adhere to the setback.**

This condition will be addressed at the time of preliminary plan.

- 17. During the review of the TCP I associated with the preliminary plan, the linear wetland in the middle of the southeastern portion of the site shall be evaluated, to ensure its protection in a manner consistent with previous approvals.**

This condition will be addressed at the time of preliminary plan.

- 18. Prior to approval of any DSP, the applicant shall donate to the M-NCPPC, by donation deed acceptable to the M-NCPPC, 100± acres including but not limited to 100-year floodplain and floodplain buffer, as shown on the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Exhibit "A".**

This condition has been addressed. The CSP indicates that 99.48 acres of land have been donated to M-NCPPC. This land area is no longer included within the CSP boundary. This condition does not need to be brought forward with the subject approval.

- 19. Land to be conveyed is subject to conditions 1 through 9, in attached Exhibit "B".**

Conditions 1 through 9 of Exhibit B, "Conditions for Conveyance of Parkland to The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission," are as follows:

- 1. An original, special warranty deed for the property to be conveyed, (signed by the WSSC Assessment Supervisor) shall be submitted to the Subdivision Section of the Development Review Division, The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC), along with the Final Plat.**

- 2. The M-NCPPC shall be held harmless for the cost of public improvements associated with land to be conveyed, including but not limited to, sewer extensions, adjacent road improvements, drains, sidewalls, curbs and gutters, and front-foot benefit charges prior to and subsequent to Final Plat.**
- 3. The boundaries and acreage of land to be conveyed to the M-NCPPC shall be indicated on all development plans and permits, which include such property.**
- 4. The land to be conveyed shall not be disturbed or filled in any way without the prior written consent of the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR). If the land is to be disturbed, the DPR shall require that a performance bond be posted to warrant restoration, repair or improvements made necessary or required by The M-NCPPC development approval process. The bond or other suitable financial guarantee (suitability to be judged by the General Counsel's Office, The M-NCPPC) shall be submitted to the DPR within two weeks prior to applying for grading permits.**
- 5. Storm drain outfalls shall be designed to avoid adverse impacts on land to be conveyed to or owned by The M-NCPPC. If the outfalls require drainage improvements on adjacent land to be conveyed to or owned by The M-NCPPC, the DPR shall review and approve the location and design of these facilities. The DPR may require a performance bond and easement agreement prior to issuance of grading permits.**
- 6. All waste matter of any kind shall be removed from the property to be conveyed. All wells shall be filled and underground structures shall be removed. The DPR shall inspect the site and verify that land is in acceptable condition for conveyance, prior to dedication.**
- 7. All existing structures shall be removed from the property to be conveyed, unless the applicant obtains the written consent of the DPR.**
- 8. The applicant shall terminate any leasehold interests on property to be conveyed to the Commission.**
- 9. No stormwater management facilities, or tree conservation or utility easements shall be proposed on land owned by or to be conveyed to The M-NCPPC without the prior written consent of the DPR. The DPR shall review and approve the location and/or design of these features. If such proposals are approved by the DPR, a performance bond and an easement agreement may be required prior to the issuance of grading permits.**

Since the land has been conveyed to M-NCPPC, this condition has been satisfied and does not need to be brought forward with the subject CSP revision.

- 20. Prior to the approval of a preliminary plan or detailed site plan, the applicant shall demonstrate:**
- a. Development plans shall show minimization of impervious surfaces, through all phases of the project, with the use of permeable paving surfaces where soil conditions provide for the use of permeable paving materials. Structured parking should be used to the maximum extent possible.**
 - b. Streams shall have a 100-foot natural buffer and a 150 foot-wide building and parking setback. There shall be a 150-foot buffer on the 100-year floodplain. If a utility must be extended into any buffer, then an equal area of natural buffer alternative shall be retained on community property.**
 - c. Clearing for utility installation shall be minimized, especially in environmentally sensitive areas, and clearing for utilities in those areas shall be coordinated, to minimize ground or buffer disturbance. Woodland disturbed for that purpose shall be reforested, in cooperation with the appropriate utility.**
 - d. The open space system, including but not limited to environmentally sensitive areas, shall extend through the site and shall link the different uses. Portions of the open space system shall be visible to and accessible from public streets.**

The above condition remains in effect and should be brought forward as a condition of the subject application.

- 21. Prior to the submission of a preliminary plan of subdivision, the applicant shall provide a plan for evaluating the resource at the Phase II level. In accordance with the Guidelines for Archeological Review, if a Phase II archeological evaluation is necessary, the applicant shall submit a research design for approval by Historic Preservation staff. After the work is completed, and before approval of the preliminary plan, the applicant shall provide a final report detailing the Phase II investigations, and shall ensure that all artifacts are curated to MHT Standards.**

The applicant has complied with the requirements of this condition for the Phase II archeological investigations. As of this date, the artifacts have not been curated, and that portion of the condition should be carried forward. Also, at the time of the Planning Board hearing the applicant stated and planning staff confirmed that documentation has been received verifying that artifacts have been deposited with the Maryland Archeological Conservation Lab.

22. If a site has been identified as significant and potentially eligible to be listed as a Historic Site or determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, the applicant shall provide a plan for:

- a. Avoiding and preserving the resource in place; or**
- b. Phase III Data Recovery investigations and interpretation.**

Phase III Data Recovery investigations shall not begin until Historic Preservation staff approves the research design. The Phase III (Treatment/Data Recovery) final report shall be reviewed for compliance with the Guidelines for Archeological Review, before approval of any grading permits within 50 feet of the perimeter of the site.

No significant archeological resources were found outside of the Melford and Cemetery environmental setting. This condition has been satisfied, and does not need to be carried forward with the subject approval.

23. Before approval of a detailed site plan for any retail uses, the plans shall demonstrate that retail uses are designed to:

- a. Create a sense of place by, among other techniques, creating a design focused upon a village or main street theme; providing amenities such as plazas, parks, recreational opportunities, entertainment and cultural activities, public services and dining; and providing attractive gateways/entries and public spaces.**
- b. Create outdoor amenities to include, at a minimum, such amenities as brick pavers, tree grates, decorative lighting, signs, banners, high-quality street furniture, and extensive landscaping, including mature trees.**
- c. Create attractive architecture by using high-quality building materials such as stone, brick, or split-face block, and providing architectural elements such as façade articulation, dormer windows, canopies, arcades, varied roofscapes and customized shopfronts, to create a street-like rhythm.**
- d. Provide attractive, quality façades on all commercial buildings visible from public spaces and streets; and completely screen loading, service, trash, HVAC, and other unsightly functions.**
- e. Create a retail area where pedestrians may travel with ease, with attractive walkways and continuous street-front experiences, to maximize the quality of the pedestrian environment. All uses shall be connected by sidewalks; crosswalks shall run through and across the parking lots and drive aisles, to**

connect all buildings and uses; sidewalks shall be wide, appealing, shaded, and configured for safe and comfortable travel; pedestrian walkways shall be separated from vehicular circulation by planting beds, raised planters, seating walls, and on-street parallel parking or structures; walking distances through parking lots shall be minimized and located to form logical and safe pedestrian crossings; and walkways shall be made more pedestrian-friendly through the use of arcades, canopies, street trees, benches, and tables and chairs.

- f. Screen parking from the streets, and ensure that attractive buildings and signage are visible from the streets.**
- g. Minimize the expanse of parking lots through the use of shared parking, structured parking or decks, or landscape islands.**
- h. Provide a hierarchy of pedestrian-scaled, high-quality, energy-efficient direct and indirect lighting that illuminates walkways, ensures safety, highlights buildings and landmark elements, and provides sight lines to other retail uses.**
- i. Create a signage package for high-quality signs and sign standards, with requirements for all retail and office tenants and owners. The standards shall address size, location, square footage, materials, logos, colors, and lighting. Any revision to existing approved signage plans shall incorporate the previously approved designs.**

Melford has a previously approved signage package that was the subject of Detailed Site Plan DSP-11008. Additionally, the applicant's design guidelines include sign standards. The previously approved sign package is intended to apply to the existing commercial, office, and research properties, and the proposed signage guidelines are intended to apply to Melford Village. The Planning Board finds that one comprehensive signage package shall be created. This could be done through a revision to DSP-11008 to consolidate the signage standards and remove inconsistencies, which may be approved by the Planning Director, as designee of the Planning Board.

- j. Eliminate all temporary signage on the site or attached to the exterior façades of a building.**
- k. Make retail pad sites compatible with the main retail/office/hotel component. If the retail pad sites are located along the street, parking shall be located to the rear of the pad sites.**

Any retail development should be designed compatibly with adjacent office or residential development, as outlined in the design guidelines. Effort should be made to locate parking for retail uses at the rear or sides of the buildings, screened from the street.

- l. Provide green areas or public plazas between pad sites.**
- m. Ensure that restaurants have attractive outdoor seating areas, with views of public spaces, lakes, or other natural features.**

The above conditions, as modified by the Planning Board, remain in effect and shall be carried forward to the subject application.

- 24. The research and development flex space shown in DSP-07031, if approved by the District Council, shall be the last research and development flex space approved in the M-X-T Zone at Melford.**

Detailed Site Plan DSP-07031 and subsequent revisions have been approved; therefore, no additional research and development flex space is permitted within the M-X-T Zone at Melford. No research and development flex space is proposed with the subject CSP revision. The above condition has been reworded to reflect that DSP-07031 has been approved and no additional research and development flex space is permitted.

- 25. All stream channels on the site should be depicted on all plans in their entirety, with the regulated stream buffer shown as required.**

The width of the stream buffers shown on the Type I tree conservation plan (TCPI) is consistent with the approved natural resources inventory (NRI) for the site. A revised NRI with addendums showing all streams, wetland limits, floodplain limits, plus a forest stand delineation for areas that have yet to be approved for clearing and accounting for clearing that has already occurred, and an update to the specimen tree list will be submitted. Current stream buffer requirements shall be applied on the NRI and at the time of preliminary plan in defining the primary management area for the site.

While the 100-foot natural buffer and the 150-foot wide buffer on the 100-year floodplain have been shown correctly on the TCPI, some sheets of the CSP do not show these buffers correctly, particularly in the southeastern corner of the property. This shall be corrected prior to certificate of approval of the CSP.

- 26. Prior to the approval of a detailed site plan, the following issues shall be addressed:**
 - a. Plans shall show the stormwater management ponds as amenities, with gentle natural slopes and extensive native planting.**

This condition remains in effect.

- b. Appropriate signage should be placed near the historic site, to call attention to the history of the area.**

The applicant installed an interpretive sign near the current entry drive to the Melford and Cemetery historic site, now accessed from Melford Boulevard. The proposed current revisions to CSP-06002 propose the relocation of the entry drive, and this should ultimately require the relocation of the interpretive sign to a location near the new entry drive to Melford House. To fully satisfy this condition, additional signage to address the Duckett Family graveyard should also be provided as part of a future DSP application. While the applicant does not currently own the graveyard property, the applicant does own the property surrounding the graveyard. Appropriate signage should be placed near the cemetery. Therefore, this condition should be carried forward until a DSP application that includes the graveyard is approved. Also, additional public interpretation should be provided on the property, and may take the form of signage, brochures, lectures, or a website.

- c. The proposed lighting system shall use full cut-off lighting systems, with limited light spill-over.**

This condition remains in effect and shall be carried forward as a condition of the subject application.

- 27. Prior to signature approval of the plans, the coversheet shall be revised to clearly indicate the limits of the application.**

The boundary of the subject CSP revision shall be revised to include all of the privately-owned properties that were the subject of CSP-06002. If the subject CSP boundary includes the same properties as the original CSP, then the subject approval may entirely supersede the previous approval, and appropriately update all necessary conditions of approval. Publicly-owned properties not subject to zoning do not need to be included in the CSP boundary.

- 28. Detailed site plans shall provide a minimum 30-foot wide landscape buffer between the development and US 50, if research and development flex space is proposed. The buffer shall be measured from the public utility easement.**

The above condition remains in effect.

- 29. Recreation Facilities Conditions:**

- a. The applicant shall provide private recreational facilities as determined appropriate at the time of review of the detailed site plan (DSP). The recreational facilities shall be constructed in accordance with the standards outlined in the Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines.**

The Prince George's County Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) recommends the following condition language, which eliminates the need for the above existing condition.

“The applicant shall allocate appropriate and developable areas for the private recreational facilities on the Home Owners Association (HOA) land. The private recreational facilities shall include playgrounds for children of all ages. The private recreational facilities shall be reviewed by the Urban Design Review Section of the Development Review Division for adequacy and property siting, prior to approval of the Detailed Site Plan by the Planning Board.”

The Planning Board concurred with this modification.

- b. Prior to certificate approval of the CSP-06002, the applicant shall revise the plan to show the conceptual trail layout of the master planned trail on donated parkland.**

The above condition was addressed prior to certification of the original CSP. The submitted CSP shows the master-planned trail on land that is currently owned by M-NCPPC. It was determined during the approval of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-07055, subsequent to the approval of CSP-06002, that the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall construct the master plan trail along the Patuxent River in conformance with DPR guidelines and standards.

- c. Prior to approval of the first final plat for the project, the applicant shall make a monetary contribution in the amount of \$250,000 for the design and construction of the Green Branch Athletic Complex.**

The required monetary contribution has been made.

- d. If necessary, a public access easement shall be recorded from US 301 to the proposed public parkland over the planned private streets to provide public access to the public park.**

In a memorandum dated October 20, 2014, DPR stated that this condition has been satisfied.

- e. The applicant shall submit three original, executed Recreational Facilities Agreements (RFA) for trail and trailhead construction to the DPR for their approval, three weeks prior to a submission of a final plat of subdivision. Upon approval by the DPR, the RFA shall be recorded among the land records of Prince George's County, Upper Marlboro, Maryland.**

This condition has been addressed. The site has a recreational facilities agreement (RFA) that has been recorded at Liber 31304, Folio 145, for the design and construction of the master plan trail and trailhead facilities along the Patuxent River. DPR requests that the RFA be amended to incorporate an asphalt parking lot and an asphalt access road to the park.

- f. **The applicant shall submit to the DPR a performance bond, letter of credit or other suitable financial guarantee, in an amount to be determined by the DPR, within at least two weeks prior to applying for building permits. Upon completion of the trail and trailhead construction, M-NCPPC shall acknowledge the applicant's donation of the trail and trailhead construction by completing the appropriate Federal and State tax forms deemed acceptable by M-NCPPC.**

As an alternative to the above language, DPR requests that the applicant submit a performance bond, letter of credit, or other suitable financial guarantee, in an amount to be determined by DPR, at least two weeks prior to issuance of a building permit for the 100th residential dwelling unit within the Melford development.

9. **2010 Prince George's County Landscape Manual:** Per Section 27-548 of the Zoning Ordinance, landscaping, screening, and buffering within the M-X-T Zone shall be provided pursuant to the provisions of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* (Landscape Manual). The applicant proposes landscape design guidelines which do not generally amend or supersede the requirements of the Landscape Manual. All landscape design guidelines that contradict the requirements of the Landscape Manual shall be removed from the proposed design guidelines prior to certification.

Conformance with the requirements of the Landscape Manual shall be determined when a more finalized plan of development is submitted for review. The following discussion is offered regarding the applicable provisions of the Landscape Manual, which will be reviewed at the time of DSP.

- a. **Section 4.1—Residential Requirements**, requires a certain number of plants to be provided for residential lots depending on their size and type. The subject development will be evaluated for conformance to Section 4.1 at the time of DSP review when a final lot number and pattern is established.

The landscape design guidelines shall be amended to state that “residential landscaping should be provided in accordance with Section 4.1 of the Prince George’s County Landscape Manual.”

- b. **Section 4.2—Requirements for Landscape Strips along Streets**, requires a landscaped strip be provided for all nonresidential uses and parking lots abutting all public and private

streets, which will occur within the commercial portions of this development. Conformance to these requirements will be evaluated at the time of DSP review.

- c. **Section 4.3**—Parking Lot Requirements, specifies that proposed parking lots larger than 7,000 square feet will be subject to Section 4.3. Section 4.3 requires that parking lots provide planting islands throughout the parking lot to reduce the impervious area. When these planting islands are planted with shade trees, the heat island effect created by large expanses of pavement may be minimized. The parking compounds will be evaluated for conformance to Section 4.3 at the time of DSP review.
 - d. **Section 4.4**—Screening Requirements, requires that all dumpsters, loading spaces, and mechanical areas be screened from adjoining existing residential uses, land in any residential zone, and constructed public streets, which will occur within the subject development. Conformance to these requirements will be evaluated at the time of DSP review.
 - e. **Section 4.6**—Compliance with Section 4.6, Buffering Development from Special Roadways, is required for any location where rear yards of single-family attached dwellings are oriented to a street of primary classification or higher. Conformance to Section 4.6 for the residential lots will be evaluated at the time of DSP review when a final lot pattern is established.
 - f. **Section 4.7**—This site will be subject to Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses. More specific information regarding bufferyard requirements along property lines adjoining other uses will be evaluated at the time of preliminary plan and DSP. A goal of Section 4.7 is to provide a comprehensive, consistent, and flexible landscape buffering system that provides transitions between moderately incompatible uses.
 - g. **Section 4.9**—This site will be subject to Section 4.9, which requires that a percentage of the proposed plant materials be native plants, along with other sustainable practices.
 - h. **Section 4.10**—This site will most likely be subject to Section 4.10, which requires street trees along private streets. The applicability of this requirement will be evaluated further at the time of preliminary plan and DSP review when public and private rights-of-way are established and designed. Nevertheless, the landscape design guidelines shall be revised to reflect that street trees shall be located between the street curb and the sidewalk consistent with Section 4.10. The proposed tree pits along the retail street do not appear consistent with this requirement.
10. **1989 Prince George’s County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance:** This property is subject to the provisions of the 1989 Prince George’s County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance because the gross tract area is in excess of 40,000 square feet, there are more than 10,000 square feet of existing woodland, and there are previously approved tree conservation plans for the site. The application is not subject to the

Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance, Subtitle 25, Division 2, which became effective September 1, 2010, because there are previously approved Type I and Type II tree conservation plans (TCPI and TCPII). The site is currently grandfathered from the requirements of Subtitle 27 which became effective on September 1, 2010 and February 1, 2012 by prior approval of the CSP.

The Type I and Type II Tree Conservation Plans (TCPI-044-98 with revisions and TCPII-036-99 with revisions, respectively) are associated with the site based on the Planning Board's previous approvals of Preliminary Plan 4-98076, Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-8601, and several Specific Design Plans (SDP-0201, SDP-0203, SDP-0301, and SDP-0405) when the site was zoned E-I-A, a comprehensive design zone.

Development of the M-X-T-zoned site requires approval of a CSP and DSP. The site was first reviewed under M-X-T requirements with the approval of CSP-06002 and TCPI-044-98-02. The scope of the CSP included a hotel, office, retail, restaurant, research and development space, and residential pods for single and multifamily attached dwellings (townhouses and condominiums, respectively) and single-family detached dwellings. Residential uses were not allowed under the previous zoning of E-I-A.

A Natural Resources Inventory, NRI-054-06, was approved for the site on February 21, 2008 which was valid for five years.

A revision to the TCPI, TCPI-044-98-03, was approved on July 8, 2009 to address future clearing for a master-planned trail on donated parkland. DPR agreed to provide 4.66 acres of off-site woodland conservation on DPR property to address the woodland conservation requirement for the development feature.

The current application is a revision to a CSP, as required for the M-X-T Zone, and a revised TCPI, for the purpose of developing approximately 115 acres located in the center of the overall Melford development to include a mix of residential and office uses, with supporting retail and community amenities to be called "Melford Village." The revised CSP proposes a pedestrian-friendly mixed-use community, which will include 260,000 square feet of office use, 100,000 square feet of retail use, and a mix of 2,500 residential units (500 townhome units, 1,000 market-rate multifamily units, and 1,000 senior age-restricted units).

11. **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 on projects that require a grading permit. Properties that are zoned M-X-T are required to provide a minimum of ten percent of the gross tract area in tree canopy. The gross tract area for the area of the CSP is 276.68 acres, resulting in a tree canopy coverage requirement of 27 acres. Compliance with this requirement will be evaluated at the time of DSP, and the Planning Board encourages the applicant to provide the required tree canopy within each of the developing parcels within Melford so that the tree canopy provided is evenly distributed.

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

- a. **Historic Preservation**—The Planning Board adopts the following findings related to historic preservation:

The Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) reviewed the subject CSP application at its October 21, 2014 meeting. HPC voted 7-0-1 (the Chairman voted “present”) in favor of the recommendations below:

Findings

- (1) The subject property includes the Melford and Cemetery Historic Site (71B-016). Built in the 1840s, Melford is a two and one-half-story brick plantation house of side-hall-and-double-parlor plan. The house is distinguished by a two-story semicircular bay and a parapetted double chimney at the south gable end. Attached to the north gable end is a lower kitchen wing built of brick and stone. The interior exhibits fine Greek Revival-style trim. The house was built by Richard Duckett and later was home to three generations of the Hardisty family. The bay and chimney configuration makes Melford House unique in Prince George’s County. The associated grounds include several early outbuildings and terraced gardens, and there is a Duckett family burial ground on a nearby knoll to the northwest. The property is also listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

The Melford and Cemetery historic site environmental setting is comprised of two parcels under different ownership. The house and associated outbuildings and gardens are owned by the applicant for CSP-06002-01, MSTC XVI LLC RE, and the cemetery parcel is owned by Marlborough CL Inc., a defunct corporation. Both parcels are within the area covered by the subject CSP application. Taken together, both components of the historic site should be considered to be focal points within the developing community.

- (2) Among those conditions approved by the District Council in its review of CSP-06002, many are applicable to the subject CSP revision application.
- (3) At the October 21, 2014 HPC meeting, HPC received a presentation on the subject application, including a discussion of conditions placed on the development by approval of the previous application. The applicant’s counsel, Mr. Robert Antonetti Esq., discussed the major changes from the original CSP application. Representing the applicant, Mr. Andrew Roud, Vice President, Land Use for St. John Properties, noted that the applicant has made approximately \$800,000 worth of improvements to the Melford house and outbuildings. These

improvements include the replacement of the standing seam metal roof on the main house; installation of gutters and downspouts; repair of the porches; repairing and repointing the masonry on the exterior of the house; replacement of several basement windows; installation of French drains around the house; repair, repainting, and reroofing of the outbuildings; and repair of the interior plaster in the main house. Mr. Mike Rosen, BSB Design Inc., provided a PowerPoint presentation that explained how LEED ND (Neighborhood Development) design principles informed the layout of the proposed development. Based on previous approvals, there has been a longstanding concern for the preservation of the views from the Melford house to the Patuxent River and to the Duckett Family Cemetery. Mr. Rosen described how building heights would be restricted in the viewshed through the design guidelines to be approved through the subject application and to ensure that the historic site would remain a centerpiece of the development. Ms. Kate Kuranda, Senior Vice President, R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates Inc., discussed possible future adaptive reuse of the property and the commitment of the applicant to adhere to the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. Mr. Antonetti proposed revisions to the existing CSP-06002 conditions to reflect the current conditions at the property and staff was in agreement with the applicant's proposed revisions.

Conclusions

- (1) Conditions 3, 7, 9, and 26b of CSP-06002 should be carried forward with the subject application until they can be met through relevant DSP applications.
- (2) Conditions 4, 5, and 6 of CSP-06002 should be refined to clarify the intent of the impact review area surrounding both components of the Melford and Cemetery environmental setting and to ensure that buildings and features visible from the environmental setting are reviewed for their compatibility of "scale, mass, proportion, and materials with the architectural character of the historic site."

Proposed revised language for Conditions 4, 5, and 6 follows:

4. Applicable detailed site plans that may affect the historic vista of the Melford and Cemetery Historic Site shall demonstrate that any portion of a proposed building either partially or fully within the designated view corridors established in CSP-06002-01 comply with the height requirements for buildings within the view corridors set forth in the design guidelines.
5. Prior to approval of any detailed site plans that include any portion of the Melford and Cemetery Historic Site (71B-016) environmental setting and impact review area, the applicant shall demonstrate that the scale, mass, proportion, materials, and

architecture for new construction in the proposed northwest and southwest neighborhoods appropriately relates to the character of the historic site.

6. Prior to Planning Board approval of the first detailed site plan for development in the northwest or southwest neighborhood(s) of Melford Village, the applicant in the historic area work permit process shall submit a plan and timetable for the protection, stabilization, restoration, and planned adaptive use of the buildings and gardens of the Melford and Cemetery historic site. The Historic Preservation Commission shall review and approve the plan and timetable through the Historic Area Work Permit (HAWP) process.
- (3) The subject application establishes and addresses long vistas/viewsheds from points within the environmental setting of Melford House. The Melford Village Design Guidelines appear to establish arbitrary points of view from Melford House that do not accommodate the full impact of new construction within the developing property. If the concept of long vistas/viewsheds is to be effective, it will require refinement in order to: (1) more fully address the views to and from both elements of the historic site's environmental setting and, (2) more precisely address how view corridor protection is to be carried out, i.e., whether or not the entirety of any building only partially located within a viewshed will be subject to a review, including but not limited to building siting, height, massing, architecture, materials, lighting, and landscaping.
 - (4) Conditions 21 and 22 have been addressed by the applicant. A Phase I archeological survey was conducted on the property in February 2005. Three archeological sites were identified on the property. Site 18PR30 is a late Archaic through Woodland period short-term base camp located adjacent to the Patuxent River floodplain. The portion of the site within the subject property had been extensively disturbed by tree removal and grading. Therefore, the site did not retain its integrity and no further work was recommended.

Site 18PR164 consists of archeological deposits and features associated with the Melford House site. Artifacts recovered date from the late eighteenth century to the present. Four cultural features and a sheet midden were identified around the house. Some of the artifacts may reflect the activities of African American slaves. Phase II investigations were recommended for site 18PR164 to assess its eligibility for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places.

Site 18PR165 is the Duckett Family Cemetery, located about 650 feet northwest of Melford House. Several shovel test pits were excavated outside of and around the cemetery to determine if there were additional unmarked burials. No evidence

of unmarked burials was found, but staff recommended that a ground penetrating radar survey of the vicinity of the cemetery be completed as part of additional required archeological investigation of the property within the limits of the subject plan.

Both Archeological Sites 18PR164 and 18PR165 are located within the Melford and Cemetery Historic Site (71B-016) environmental setting.

- (5) Phase II archeological investigations were conducted on Sites 18PR164 and 18PR165 between February and October 2008. The final Phase II report was accepted by Historic Preservation staff on June 22, 2009. Intact cultural deposits and features were identified within the Melford and Cemetery historic site environmental setting. Evidence was found of extensive landscape alterations in the early twentieth century. A ground penetrating radar survey was conducted in areas outside of the Duckett family graveyard and its environmental setting, which were proposed for development. No anomalies were identified that indicate the presence of unmarked graves, although the possibility of encountering unmarked graves is always present. Staff concurred with the report's findings that no further work is necessary outside of the Melford and Cemetery Historic Site (71B-016) environmental setting. However, if ground disturbance is proposed within the environmental setting, a Historic Area Work Permit will be required. The applicant should provide proof that all artifacts from the Phase I and II investigations have been properly curated at the Maryland Archaeological Conservation Lab prior to the submission of any preliminary plan.

Prior to approval of any DSP that includes a portion of the Melford and Cemetery environmental setting, in consultation with archeology staff, the applicant should provide for additional public interpretation of the significance of archeological findings within the property. That public interpretation may take the form of on-site signage, a printed brochure, public lectures, or a website. The location and wording of any additional signage, brochure text, or website should be subject to approval by the Prince George's County Planning Department staff archeologist.

- (6) At the October 21, 2014 HPC meeting, the applicant's counsel, Mr. Robert Antonetti Esq., briefed HPC on several proposed changes to existing conditions that reflect the current conditions of the historic site. Staff agreed with the proposed changes, as they reflect the substantial rehabilitation of the main house and outbuildings that was completed several years ago and has been monitored and maintained by the applicant since then.

HPC reviewed the language of the proposed revisions as well as a staff generated addition to Finding 1 (above). Commissioner Schneider moved that HPC forward the staff recommendations, as modified by an addition to Finding 1, and the applicant's and staff's proposed revisions to Conditions 4, 5, 6, and 21 to the

Planning Board for its review of CSP-06002-01. Commissioner Pruden seconded the motion and it passed with a vote of 7-0-1 (the Chair voted “present”).

Recommendations

- (1) HPC recommends that the existing CSP-06002 Conditions 3, 7, and 9 should be carried forward to subsequent applications.
- (2) HPC also recommends that CSP-06002 Conditions 4, 5, 6, and 21 should be revised as follows:
 4. Applicable detailed site plans that may affect the historic vista of the Melford and Cemetery Historic Site shall demonstrate that any portion of a proposed building either partially or fully within the designated view corridors established in CSP-06002-01 comply with the height requirements for buildings within the view corridors set forth in the design guidelines.
 5. Prior to approval of any detailed site plans that include any portion of the Melford and Cemetery Historic Site (71B-016) environmental setting and impact review area, the applicant shall demonstrate that the scale, mass, proportion, materials, and architecture for new construction in the proposed northwest and southwest neighborhoods appropriately relates to the character of the historic site.
 6. Prior to Planning Board approval of the first detailed site plan for development in the northwest or southwest neighborhood(s) of Melford Village, the applicant in the historic area work permit process shall submit a plan and timetable for the protection, stabilization, restoration, and planned adaptive use of the buildings and gardens of the Melford and Cemetery Historic Site. The Historic Preservation Commission shall review and approve the plan and timetable through the Historic Area Work Permit (HAWP) process.
 21. Prior to the submission of a preliminary plan of subdivision, the applicant shall ensure that all artifacts are curated to Maryland Historical Trust standards. The applicant shall demonstrate that the curated artifact collection and associated documentation have been deposited with the Maryland Archeological Conservation Lab.
- (3) In addition, HPC recommends a new condition for CSP-06002-01 to address the interpretation of archeological findings and the historic features of the property at the center of the development:

Prior to the approval of any detailed site plan that includes a portion of the Melford and Cemetery environmental setting, in consultation with archeology staff, the applicant shall provide for additional public interpretation of the significance of archeological findings within the property. That public interpretation may take the form of on-site signage, a printed brochure, public lectures, or a website. The location and wording of any additional signage, brochure text, or website shall be subject to approval by the Prince George's County Planning Department staff archeologist.

The historic preservation conditions have been included in this approval.

b. **Community Planning**—The Community Planning determinations are as follows:

- This application is not inconsistent with the Plan Prince George's 2035 policies for a town center.
- This application is not inconsistent with the 2006 Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan's policies for Melford, as amended by Plan Prince George's 2035.
- Plan Prince George's 2035 created new center designations to replace those found in the 2002 Prince George's County Approved General Plan, and classified the Bowie Town Center as a "Town Center." Center designations in Plan Prince George's 2035 carry with them general guidelines for:
 - The mix of housing,
 - The average housing density for new development,
 - Floor area ratios for new commercial development, and
 - Characteristics of the transportation system that supersede housing, commercial, and transportation goals and policies found in earlier master, sector, functional, transit district development and town center development plans. Other than in these four areas, the recommendations of an earlier-approved master, sector, functional, transit district development and town center development plan remain in full force and effect.

While the proposed concept is not inconsistent with Plan Prince George's 2035 or the Bowie Master Plan, the applicant should consider providing for future office or employment uses on-site, should the market for such uses improve.

The following summarized information was provided:

Plan Prince George's 2035

The proposed development is part of the Bowie Town Center and is also identified as an employment center. The proposed mix of housing, average housing density, commercial

development, and transportation characteristics support the Plan Prince George's 2035 guidelines for the larger Bowie Town Center.

2006 Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment

The 2006 Bowie and Vicinity SMA rezoned the subject property from the E-I-A Zone to the M-X-T Zone. In the discussion of this rezoning, the SMA states that the intent of this rezoning is “to promote development and redevelopment of land in the vicinity of a major interchange (US 50 and US 301), with an emphasis on a moderate- to high-density mix of office/ employment/retail/hotel, residential, and parkland/open space uses. The M-X-T Zone will permit a flexible response to the market by allowing for and encouraging a diversity of land uses, provide a source of desirable employment opportunities, and foster a live/work environment. . .”

The master plan classified Melford as a mixed-use area, intended for mixed use (residential and commercial).

- (1) The amount of residential development proposed at this location makes it attractive for some sort of transit service, as it can be reasonably expected that a number of residents will be commuting to destinations on the Metrorail system and could benefit from direct transit connections to downtown Washington, DC or New Carrollton. At the time of DSP, the applicant should show transit stop locations on each map, and should strive to provide supportive amenities such as benches, shade trees, trash receptacles, and other amenities to serve residents/ workers/visitors waiting for transit services. The prototypical bus stop is insufficient in and of itself to accommodate the potential number of transit riders in such a dense development.

The Planning Board finds that if transit or bus service is established in the future, DSPs shall show the locations of the proposed transit stops and provide amenities such as shelters, benches, shade trees, and trash receptacles.

- (2) The discussion of parking on page 67 of the applicant's design guidelines should include an analysis of parking demand. The suggested market demand for parking and the demonstration of Baltimore and Howard Counties' outdated parking requirements as examples are not persuasive. This community is intended to encourage walking, biking, and transit. There should be a thorough analysis that demonstrates a demonstrable measurable demand for parking above the required parking ratios in the Zoning Ordinance.
- (3) Given the master plan's recommendation to “minimize the expanse of parking lots through the use of shared parking, structured parking or decks, and/or landscape islands,” the applicant should consider shared parking solutions in surface and structured lots, to reduce single-use parking.

A detailed parking analysis shall be provided at the time of DSP, as required by the Zoning Ordinance, and not at the time of CSP. Specific parking ratios shall not be approved at this time.

- (4) Given Melford’s inclusion in a Plan Prince George’s 2035 employment area and the Master Plan’s vision of Melford as an employment area, the applicant should consider providing for potential office and employment uses within the proposed development, should market conditions support such development in the future.

To satisfy the above request, the proposed retail area west of Melford Boulevard should be designated for retail, institutional, or office uses.

- (5) The applicant should include on the cover page of the CSP more detail under General Note 4 to show how much office/employment, residential, and retail is being proposed.

Item 5 of the recommendations has been brought forward as a condition of approval.

c. **Research**—The Special Projects comments are summarized as follows:

Melford was designated as an employment area in Plan Prince George’s 2035. The chart below provides a conservative estimate of the amount of employees the current and approved office, flex, hotel and retail space can support. A total of 4,558 employees could comfortably be accommodated at Melford representing a significant employment base.

Use	Existing SF/Rooms	Proposed SF/Rooms	Employees per SF/Room	Total Employees
Census	N/A	N/A	N/A	207
IDA	N/A	N/A	N/A	160
Warehouse	N/A	N/A	N/A	70
Call Center	N/A	N/A	N/A	250
Office	469,434 SF	91,720 SF	200 SF	2,805
Flex	320,840 SF	260,730 SF	800 SF	726
Retail	N/A	100,000 SF	400 SF	250
Hotel	N/A	362 Rooms	0.25 Room	90
Total				4,558

The current vacancy rates in the existing office and flex space are above 25 percent and part of the leasing difficulties may be due to the lack of local-serving retail goods and services in the area. The introduction of residential will help support ancillary retail goods and services, thereby improving the attractiveness of the area to potential employers.

The applicant is proposing 2,500 dwelling units in total composed of 1,000 age-restricted senior units, 500 townhomes, and 1,000 multifamily units. Based on the unit mix, the total population of the community will be approximately 5,615 residents. One way to assess

whether or not the area should still be considered an employment area even with the introduction of residents is to look at the area’s job to population ratio as compared to the county as a whole. Currently, the countywide job to population ratio is 0.36. After the introduction of 5,615 residents and the potential for 4,558 employees, the Melford area’s jobs to population ratio would be 0.81, more than double the current countywide jobs to population ratio of 0.36. Even with the introduction of residential uses, Melford will still be a significant employment area within the county.

- d. **Transportation Planning**—The Planning Board reviewed comments on the CSP application and the traffic impact study report submitted by the applicant, as follows:

The subject property was rezoned to the M-X-T Zone as part of the 2006 Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan and SMA approval process. Consequently, a traffic study is required for this CSP application. The applicant prepared a traffic impact study dated May 30, 2014, in accordance with the methodologies in the “Transportation Review Guidelines, Part 1” (Guidelines). The study was referred to the DPW&T, SHA, and the City of Bowie. The findings outlined below are based upon a review of all of the materials received and analyses conducted by staff, and are consistent with the Guidelines.

Pursuant to the findings of Council Resolution CR-11-2006, and in conjunction with the scoping agreement between the applicant and staff, the traffic impact study identified the following intersections as the ones on which the proposed development would have the most impact:

EXISTING CONDITIONS		
Intersection	AM (LOS/CLV)	PM (LOS/CLV)
MD 3 & MD 450-Gas Station Access	D/1426	D/1305
Belair Drive & Ramp from MD 3 Southbound	A/512	A/443
Belair Drive & Ramps to/from MD 3 Northbound	A/266	A/497
US 301 & Gov. Bridge Road-Harbor Way	B/1028	B/1114
Melford Boulevard & Science Drive (Roundabout)	A/0.278 (v/c)	A/0.219 (v/c)
Curie Drive & Science Drive (Roundabout)	A/0.117 (v/c)	A/0.061 (v/c)

The traffic study also identified nine background developments whose impact would affect some or all of the study intersections. All of these background developments are built, but are at various levels of occupancy. Those background developments are approved under the following applications:

- Specific Design Plan SDP-0103
- Specific Design Plan SDP-0104

- Specific Design Plan SDP-0201
- Specific Design Plan SDP-0203/01
- Specific Design Plan SDP-0402
- Specific Design Plan SDP-0405
- Detailed Site Plan DSP-06096
- Detailed Site Plan DSP-07072
- Detailed Site Plan DSP-07031

Additionally, a growth rate of one percent per year (for six years) was applied to the existing traffic counts along MD 3/US 301. A second analysis was done to evaluate the impact of the background developments on existing infrastructure. The analysis revealed the following results:

BACKGROUND CONDITIONS		
Intersection	AM (LOS/CLV)	PM (LOS/CLV)
MD 3 & MD 450-Gas Station Access	F/1758	E/1591
Belair Drive & Ramp from MD 3 Southbound	B/1109	A/775
Belair Drive & Ramps to/from MD 3 Northbound	A/841	D/1338
US 301 & Gov. Bridge Road-Harbor Way	D/1339	D/1318
Melford Boulevard & Science Drive (Roundabout)	F/1.809 (v/c)	F/2.169 (v/c)
Curie Drive & Science Drive (Roundabout)	A/0.547 (v/c)	A/0.278 (v/c)

An analysis of the traffic data under total conditions represents a combination of background traffic and site-generated traffic. The following land uses were used in the study as the basis for computing site-generated traffic:

		AM			PM		
		In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Retail							
Retail	268,500 square feet	177	108	285	557	604	1,161
	Less internal trips	27	16	43	61	90	151
	Less pass-by (40%)	60	37	97	198	206	404
Total Retail (new trips)		90	55	145	298	308	606
Residential							
Townhouse	500	70	280	350	260	140	400
Multi-family (apartments)	1,000	104	416	520	390	210	600
Senior Adult Housing	1,000	58	127	185	142	80	222
	Less internal trips	13	49	62	85	50	135

Total Residential (new trips)		219	774	993	707	380	1,087
Commercial/Office							
Office - General	136,520 square feet	246	27	273	48	205	253
Office - Medical	150,000 square feet	345	83	428	180	390	570
Museum	100,000 square feet	32	8	40	8	32	40
Woodland Conservation Parcels		1	1	2	1	1	2
	Less internal trips	36	11	47	18	24	42
Total Commercial/Office (new)		588	108	696	219	604	823
TOTAL NEW TRIPS (off-site)							
		897	937	1,834	1,224	1,292	2,516

Using trip generation rates from the Guidelines, as well as the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition, the study has determined that the proposed development, based on the above-mentioned uses, would generate a net total of 1,834 (897 in, 937 out) AM peak hour trips and 2,516 (1,224 in, 1,292 out) PM peak hour trips. Using these site-generated trips, an analysis of total traffic conditions was done, and the following results were determined:

TOTAL CONDITIONS		
Intersection	AM (LOS/CLV)	PM (LOS/CLV)
MD 3 & MD 450-Gas Station Access	F/1693	E/1547
Belair Drive & Ramp from MD 3 Southbound	A/960	A/790
Belair Drive & Ramps to/from MD 3 Northbound	A/670	C/1216
US 301 & Gov. Bridge Road-Harbor Way	C/1264	C/1277
Melford Boulevard & Science Drive (Signalized)	B/1077	D/1389
Melford Boulevard & Science Drive (Roundabout)	C/0.892	F/1.396
Melford Boulevard & Telsa Drive-Site entrance (Roundabout)	C/0.852 (v/c)	A/0.751 (v/c)
Melford Boulevard & Telsa Drive-Curie Drive (Roundabout)	A/0.643 (v/c)	B/0.568 (v/c)
Curie Drive & Science Drive (Roundabout)	A/0.400 (v/c)	A/0.243 (v/c)

The results shown in the table above have indicated that there are two intersections that would operate unacceptably under total traffic conditions. One of these intersections is located within the MD 3/US 301 corridor, where the use of mitigation (CR-29-1994) is allowed. To that end, the applicant has evaluated an option where specific improvements were tested based on the mitigation guidelines. Specifically, the applicant has proposed the following lane configurations:

MD 3/MD 450/Gas Station Access intersection

- Provide a fourth northbound and southbound through lane (Note: This improvement has already been constructed by the applicant).

Melford Boulevard & Science Drive

- Convert the existing roundabout to a traditional four-legged signalized intersection.

With these improvements in place, the MD 3/MD 450 intersection was found to operate adequately within the boundaries established by CR-29-1994. The intersection of Melford Boulevard/Science Drive will also operate adequately.

The traffic study concludes that the provision of a second left-turn lane on the west leg of the intersection of US 301/Governor Bridge Road/Harbor Way will mitigate the site impact by more than 150 percent (NOTE: This improvement has already been constructed by the applicant). It further indicates that, with all of the improvements identified, the roadway system can accommodate the proposed development.

Based on the preceding findings, the Transportation Planning Section determines that the plan conforms to the required findings for approval of the CSP from the standpoint of transportation if the application is approved with the following conditions:

- (1) The proposed development should be limited to a mix of uses where the net new trips shall not exceed 4,441 AM and 4,424 PM peak hour trips. Any development with an impact beyond that identified herein above shall require a revision to the CSP with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities.
- (2) At the time of the preliminary plan, the applicant should reevaluate the intersection of Melford Boulevard/Science Drive to determine what improvements will be needed at various phases of the proposed development.

e. **Subdivision Review**—The Subdivision Review analysis of the subject application is as follows:

- (1) **Previous Preliminary Plan Approvals:** Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-98076 for 153.20 acres, including a portion of the subject site, was approved by the Planning Board on September 28, 2000 (PGCPB Resolution No. 99-28(A)). The resolution contains 17 conditions, and Condition 17 states the following:
 - 17. Any further development of the subject site that would generate more than 2,200 AM and 2,605 PM trips will require the submission of a new preliminary plat with a new traffic impact study.**

Preliminary Plan 4-07055 for 176.19 acres, including a portion of the subject site, was approved by the Planning Board on June 19, 2008 (PGCPB Resolution No. 08-86). Preliminary Plan 4-07055 approved no residential uses on the property. The resolution contains 34 conditions, and Conditions 4 and 32 relate to the review of this application.

- 4. Total development within the subject property shall be limited to uses within the M-X-T Zone that generate no more than 392 AM trips and 875 PM trips for Pod 1, and 874 AM trips and 1272 PM peak trips for Pods 5, 6, 7, 7B and P2 combined. Any development with an impact beyond that identified herein above shall require a revision to the CSP and a new preliminary plan with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities.**

- 32. Any residential development of the subject property shall require the approval of a new preliminary plan of subdivision prior to the approval of detailed site plans.**

The two trip caps above apply to the entire subject property for land that is the subject of Preliminary Plans 4-98076 and 4-07055. A new preliminary plan is required to address the alteration and the required findings of Subtitle 24 of the County Code, which include adequate transportation facilities. Residential uses were not contemplated on the property with the approval of 4-98076 and 4-07055.

- (2) **Consistency with Record Plats:** The applicant has submitted survey information to verify the legal configuration of the parcels within the CSP.

- (3) **Private Roads and Easements:** Section 24-128, Private roads and easements, of the Subdivision Regulations discuss road layouts for a subdivision. Specifically, in this instance, the property is subject to Section 24-128(b)(7)(A) which provides:
 - (7) **In Comprehensive Design and Mixed Use Zones:**
 - (A) **For land in the V-L, V-M, R-L, R-S, R-M, R-U, M-U-I, L-A-C, M A C, M-X-C, M-U-TC, and M-X-T Zones, the Planning Board may approve a subdivision (and all attendant plans of development) with private roads to serve attached single-family dwellings, two-family dwellings, and three-family dwellings, but not single-family detached or multifamily dwellings, in accordance with the requirements of Subsections (e) and (f) of Section 27-433 of the Zoning Ordinance, except as hereinafter provided. In all of the above zones, and in the R-R Zone when developed as a cluster**

subdivision, the Planning Board may approve a subdivision with alleys to serve any permitted use, provided the lot has frontage on and pedestrian access to a public right-of-way. The District Council may disapprove the inclusion of alleys during the consideration of the detailed site plan for a cluster subdivision. For the purposes of this Section, an “alley” shall mean a road providing vehicular access to the rear or side of abutting lots, and which is not intended for general traffic circulation.

- (i) The pavement width of private roads may be reduced to not less than a minimum of twenty-two (22) feet when it is determined that the provision of the minimum width is consistent with a safe, efficient, hierarchical street system for a development.**
- (ii) The pavement width of private alleys shall be not less than eighteen (18) feet when it is determined that the provision of the minimum width is consistent with a safe, efficient, vehicular access to individual lots. Since alleys only provide vehicular access to lots with frontage on a public street, alleys shall not be required to be improved with street trees or curb and gutter, unless a drainage problem has been identified by the Department of Environmental Resources or the Department of Public Works and Transportation.**

The CSP proposes 2,000 multifamily dwelling units and shows many multifamily buildings throughout the site. Sheet 6 of the CSP shows a street network of primary routes (boulevards), secondary routes (streets), and tertiary routes (alleys/access drives). The applicant has indicated that the primary routes will be public rights-of-way and the secondary and alley streets will be private rights-of-way. Based on the development layout, it appears that many of the multifamily buildings will have frontage and access to private streets. Pursuant to Section 24-128(b)(7)(A), a private street is not permitted to serve the multifamily parcels.

The CSP proposes 500 townhouse units, and the proposed townhouse layout shows that the majority of the townhouse lots will have frontage on secondary routes (private streets) and access by the private alleys. Sheet 9 of the CSP shows the street cross section and indicates that the neighborhood streets will be 62 feet wide and the residential alleys will be 24 feet wide. Pursuant to Section 24-128(b)(7)(A), a residential subdivision can utilize alleys if lots have frontage on and pedestrian access to a public right-of-way. A variation request to

Section 24-128(b)(7)(A) would be required at the time of the preliminary plan to allow the fronting of townhouses on a private street rather than public street for the use of alleys. The design of the alleys will be reviewed and the applicant should anticipate modifications to the layout.

The Street Sections section on pages 18 and 19 of the Melford Village Design Guidelines provides a concept of different features within the proposed private and public rights-of-way. The Street Sections section should be revised to include the property line and the public utility easement. The CSP does not provide any conceptual layout of how the public utilities will be accommodated within the proposed development site. Pursuant to Section 24-122(a) for public road and Section 24-128(b)(12) for private road, a ten-foot-wide public utility easement should be adjacent to all rights-of-way. A color coded utility plan should be submitted with the preliminary plan application for review and conceptual approval by all of the affected utilities.

A more detailed review of the lot and parcel layout, circulation, and the relationship of land uses will occur at the time of preliminary plan review.

The entire subject property as shown on the CSP should be filed under one preliminary plan. Pursuant to Section 27-270 (Order of Approvals) of the Zoning Ordinance, CSP-06002-01 will need to be approved prior to approval of the preliminary plan.

f. **Trails**—The trails analysis of the subject application is as follows:

- (1) **Master Plan:** The 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* (MPOT) and the area master plan identify two master plan trail corridors that impact the subject site, as shown on the plan maps for the MPOT and area master plan. A trail is shown along the Patuxent River corridor that will potentially connect to existing and planned parkland both to the north and south, and a connector trail is shown linking the future development on the Melford site with the stream valley trail along the Patuxent River.

The MPOT also includes a complete streets element that contains several policies related to accommodations for bicyclists and pedestrians along new road construction. The Complete Streets section includes the following policies regarding sidewalk construction and the accommodation of pedestrians.

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.

The area master plan and MPOT recommend two master plan trails that impact the subject property. As noted above, a stream valley trail is recommended along the Patuxent River, and one trail connection is shown linking the Melford site with the trail along the Patuxent River. The submitted CSP includes the stream valley trail along much of the length of the Patuxent River along the subject site, and two trail connections are included that link the proposed development with the master plan trail. The conceptual pedestrian network plan shows the stream valley trail extending south through the site to Marconi Drive, where it apparently continues as a sidewalk to the southern property edge. The extension of the trail the entire length of the stream valley is recommended.

The subject application includes sidewalks on both sides of the internal roads and several internal trail/bicycle connections, in addition to the master plan trail. The trail along the Patuxent River corridor is shown as two connections from both the north and south ends of the development. These connections appear to meet the intent of the master plan recommendations. A modified grid road network is being proposed which appears to accommodate relatively small block sizes and include sufficient crossing opportunities for pedestrians. In addition to the proposed network of sidewalks, pedestrian access is further supplemented by the stream valley trail, the trail around the pond, and the proposed trail/bicycle routes. The trail limits and alignment are acceptable as shown on the submitted trail construction plans and fulfill the master plan recommendation for a trail along the stream valley.

- (2) **Conceptual Site Plan Review:** Although an extensive network of sidewalks and trails is proposed, on-road bicycle facilities do not appear to be included on most roads, although shared lane markings appear to be indicated on Melford Boulevard. The applicant worked with the City of Bowie to develop the road cross sections, and the overall vision for the subject site is for an urban street network where traffic is relatively slow, traffic patterns are dispersed across a “grid” street network, and bicycles share the travel lane with automobiles. In this regard, the applicant is proposing shared lane markings and “Bikes May Use Full Lane” signs along some roads. Full separated bicycle lanes may be warranted along major roads to better accommodate bicyclists, given the density and number of dwelling units being proposed on the site. The need for additional dedication and full bicycle lanes can be explored with the applicant and the City of Bowie at the time of preliminary plan. Pending discussions with the City of Bowie, it may be appropriate to include designated bicycle lanes along some of the major internal roads or boulevards. Bicycle lanes may be most appropriate along the primary routes through the site (the boulevards) and/or the designated bicycle routes.

The site is within the Bowie regional center and will be subject to the requirements of Council Bill CB-2-2012 and the “Transportation Review Guidelines, Part 2” at the time of preliminary plan. A finding of bicycle and pedestrian adequacy and compliance with the guidelines will be made at the time of preliminary plan.

From the standpoint of non-motorized transportation, it is determined that this plan is acceptable, fulfills the intent of applicable master plans and functional plans, and meets the findings required for a CSP. The need for additional dedication and designated bicycle lanes will be evaluated at the time of preliminary plan in consultation with the City of Bowie.

On October 24, 2014, staff met with the applicant and the City of Bowie’s Planning Director to discuss the applicant’s proposal for on-road bicycle facilities. The design guidelines propose shared lane markings, or “sharrows,” along Melford Boulevard only. No designated on-road bicycle facilities are shown along the neighborhood streets or the east-west and north-south boulevards. The City of Bowie fully supports the proposal, including the proposal of sharrows instead of bicycle lanes along Melford Boulevard. During the City’s review of the plans, it was discussed that the sharrows facilitate a more compact street section. The City believes it is preferable to retain the existing right-of-way width for all improvements along Melford Boulevard.

The appropriateness of the applicant’s planned street section will be evaluated in detail at the time of preliminary plan.

- g. **Prince George’s County Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR)**—In a memorandum dated October 20, 2014, DPR provided the following summarized comments:

The applicant fulfilled the requirements of Condition 29b, c, d, and e of Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06002, which includes donation of 96.5 acres of parkland along the Patuxent River; entering into a public recreational facilities agreements (RFA), recorded at Liber 31304, Folio 145, for the design and construction of the master plan trail and trailhead facilities along the Patuxent River; and making a monetary contribution of \$250,000 for the design and construction of the Green Branch Athletic Complex, which is located in close proximity to the subject development.

In addition, the applicant proposes on-site private recreational amenities, including open plazas, courtyards, pocket parks, three clubhouses with outdoor pools, and an amphitheater. With this CSP, the applicant shows planned recreational areas including open plazas, courtyards, pocket parks, waterfront parks, an amphitheater, and clubhouses. The details for development of these recreational areas will be refined at the time of the DSP. DPR recommends that these recreational areas should include playgrounds for children of all ages.

The public RFA recorded at Liber 31304, Folio 145, requires the applicant to construct public recreational facilities on dedicated parkland prior to issuance of 50 percent of the building permits in Pod 7 and submission of the performance bond prior to issuance of any building permit in Pod 7 on Preliminary Plan 4-07055. DPR evaluated the boundaries of the CSP-06002-01 application and Pod 7 and determined that approximately 1,007 residential dwelling units will be located within Pod 7. DPR and the applicant agreed that the timing for the construction of public recreational facilities on dedicated parkland should be refined from prior to issuance of 50 percent of the building permits in Pod 7 to prior to issuance of a building permit for the 500th residential dwelling unit within the Melford development. In addition, DPR agreed that the applicant should submit the performance bond, letter of credit, or other suitable financial guarantee for the construction of public recreational facilities on dedicated parkland prior to issuance of a building permit for the 100th residential dwelling unit within the Melford development.

DPR concludes that, with the recommended modification to the proposed package of private and public recreational facilities as described in the recommendation section below, the applicant will fulfill the recreational needs of the future Melford residents and the surrounding community.

DPR recommends to the Planning Board that approval of Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06002-01 be subject to the following conditions:

- (1) The applicant shall complete construction of a ten-foot-wide asphalt surface hiker/bicyclist/equestrian trail, four boardwalks, a 15-space asphalt parking lot, an asphalt access road, and trailhead facilities on the adjacent Patuxent River Park prior to issuance of a building permit for the 500th residential dwelling unit within the Melford development.
- (2) Prior to the first residential building permit, the applicant shall submit to DPR for review and approval revised construction drawings for public recreational facilities. These drawings shall include the details for construction of the planned asphalt parking lot and asphalt access road.
- (3) The applicant shall construct at least two eight-foot-wide asphalt trail connectors from the residential neighborhood to the master-planned trail on dedicated parkland. The location of the trail connectors shall be established at the time of DSP review and approval.
- (4) The applicant shall submit to DPR a performance bond, letter of credit, or other suitable financial guarantee, in an amount to be determined by DPR, within at least two weeks prior to issuance of a building permit for the 100th residential dwelling unit within the Melford development.

- (5) Prior to submission of any final plat of subdivision for the residential component of the Melford development, the public recreational facilities agreement (RFA) recorded at Liber 34304, Folio 145, shall be amended to incorporate an asphalt parking lot, an asphalt access road to the park, timing of construction, and bonding of the recreational facilities. Upon DPR approval, the RFA shall be recorded among the Land Records of Prince George's County, Upper Marlboro, Maryland.
 - (6) The applicant shall allocate appropriate and developable areas for the private recreational facilities on the homeowners association land. The private recreational facilities shall include playgrounds for children of all ages. The private recreational facilities shall be reviewed by the Urban Design Review Section of the Development Review Division for adequacy and proper siting, prior to approval of the DSP by the Planning Board.
- h. **Environmental Planning**—The Planning Board reviewed an analysis of the application's conformance with the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance (WCO), along with the following summarized comments:
- (1) A Natural Resource Inventory, NRI-056-08, was approved for the subject property on February 21, 2008 and was submitted with the current application. A revised NRI is not required at this time, but will be submitted for approval prior to preliminary plan.
 - (2) The Maryland Department of Natural Resources (MDNR), Wildlife and Heritage Division, issued a letter dated May 18, 2001 that states that there are no records of rare, threatened or endangered (RTE) plants or animals within this project site. A MDNR database indicates that there are recent records of species of concern known to occur within the vicinity of the site; however, the portions of the subject property currently under review would not be likely to support the species listed. Much of the subject property currently under review, while presently wooded, has been disturbed over the course of the last few decades as indicated by the presence of Virginia pine and the small diameter of the trees on-site. If any regulated species are present on the site, they would most likely be located within the areas proposed for preservation: the streams, wetlands, floodplain, and their associated buffers. An updated letter from MDNR regarding the presence of RTE on the site shall be submitted as an amendment to the NRI.
 - (3) Prior to grading of the site, the county requires approval of an erosion and sediment control plan. The TCP must reflect the ultimate limits of disturbance not only for installation of permanent site infrastructure, but also for the installation of all temporary infrastructure including erosion and sediment control measures. A copy of the erosion and sediment control concept plan must be submitted at the

time of preliminary plan so that the ultimate limits of disturbance for the project can be verified and shown on the TCP.

The environmental conditions have been included in this approval.

- i. **Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department**—No response was received from the Fire/EMS Department. The Fire/EMS Department will have an opportunity to comment on future detailed applications within Melford.
- j. **Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE)**—In a memorandum dated September 16, 2014 , DPIE provided comments on the CSP. DPIE notes that coordination with the City of Bowie will be necessary for on-site grading, stormdrain, and stormwater management. The applicant shall acquire concept and permit approvals from Prince George's County and SHA for any off-site road improvements that are required as a part of the traffic impact study. The stormwater management plan is to be approved by the City of Bowie.
- k. **Prince George's County Police Department**—In a memorandum dated June 19, 2014, the Police Department indicated that there are no crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) related issues with the subject application.
- l. **Prince George's County Health Department**—In a memorandum dated October 24, 2014, the Health Department provided the following comments:
 - (1) Due to proximity to two major highway arterials, numerous residential and office units are potentially to be sited within the 65 dBA Ldn zones. Noise can be detrimental to health with respect to hearing impairment, sleep disturbance, cardiovascular effects, psycho-physiologic effects, psychiatric symptoms, and fetal development. Sleep disturbances have been associated with a variety of health problems, such as functional impairment, medical disability, and increased use of medical services even among those with no previous health problems. Future plans should include the 65 dBA Ldn impact zone in order to properly assess and minimize the potential adverse health impacts of noise on any susceptible populations.

The future preliminary plan and DSP will have to address noise issues as more detailed site design is determined.

- (2) Scientific research has demonstrated that a high-quality pedestrian environment can support walking both for utilitarian purposes and for pleasure, leading to positive health outcomes.

The submitted CSP proposes to have sidewalks along both sides of all public and private roads along with multiple trails, which will contribute to a high-quality pedestrian environment.

- (3) Research shows that access to public transportation can have major health benefits. It can be good for connectedness and walkability. There were observed proposed bus stops for future mass transit identified on page 20 of the Melford Village Design Guidelines.

This is noted. Bus facilities will have to be further analyzed at the time of preliminary plan and DSP when final road locations are determined.

- (4) Living in proximity to green space is associated with reduced self-reported health symptoms, better self-rated health, and higher scores on general health questionnaires. The site proposes a ten percent tree canopy coverage area; this will be an added health benefit to the surrounding community.

This is noted. Future plans will have to continue to show conformance to the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance.

- (5) There are no existing carryout/convenience store food facilities located within a one-half mile radius of this location. However, there are 14 existing carryout/convenience store food facilities within a one- to two-mile radius of the proposed Melford community. Research has found that people who live near an abundance of fast-food restaurants and convenience stores compared to grocery stores and fresh produce vendors, have a significantly higher prevalence of obesity and diabetes. Future plans should include the number of proposed carryout and convenience stores that will be present within the community.

This is noted. The Planning Board encourages the applicant to be considerate in their choices of tenants to ensure that there are high-quality healthy food choices for the future residents.

- (6) There are ten market/grocery store options within a one- to two-mile radius of this location. A 2008 report by the University of California, Los Angeles, Center for Health Policy Research found that the presence of a supermarket in a neighborhood predicts higher fruit and vegetable consumption and a reduced prevalence of overweight and obesity.

The Planning Board encourages the applicant to target a grocery store tenant, or other uses, that might provide high-quality healthy food choices, as they continue to develop the proposed commercial-retail portion of the subject property.

- (7) During the construction phases of this project, no dust should be allowed to cross over property lines and impact adjacent properties. Indicate intent to conform to construction activity dust control requirements as specified in the 2011 Maryland Standards and Specifications for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control.

Future DSPs for the property should indicate the applicant's intent to conform to the mentioned requirements.

- (8) During the construction phases of this project, no noise should be allowed to adversely impact activities on the adjacent properties. Future plans should indicate intent to conform to construction activity noise control requirements as specified in Subtitle 19 of the County Code.

Future DSPs for the property should indicate the applicant's intent to conform to the mentioned requirements.

- m. **Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA)**—In a memorandum dated July 15, 2014, SHA requested that the applicant provide revisions to the prepared traffic impact study and submit those revisions with a point-by-point response.

The referral is preliminary in nature and did not indicate the need for dedication or reservation, nor did it specify frontage improvements for the subject proposal. Through referral comments and correspondence with SHA and Lenhart Traffic Consulting, the Transportation Planning Section was able to determine that existing transportation facilities will be adequate to carry anticipated traffic for the proposed development. The transportation network will be reviewed in detail at the time of preliminary plan, and a traffic impact study will be referred to SHA for evaluation at that time.

- n. **Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)**—In a comments dated June 18, 2014, WSSC expressed the inability to provide comments on the CSP due to the lack of water and sewer pipeline information on the plans. Such information would need to be provided at the time of DSP, when the exact locations of proposed buildings and proposed water and sewer easements will be reviewed. The location of the buildings and structures in relation to WSSC easements will be required to meet WSSC standards.

- o. **Verizon**—In an e-mail dated June 19, 2014, Verizon indicated that the subject application will need to provide a suitable public utility easement parallel, contiguous, and adjacent to all public and private road and alley rights-of-way, free and clear of all obstructions, at no greater than a 4:1 slope.

The applicant aims to provide a nonstandard public utility easement arrangement. This issue will be reviewed in depth at the time of preliminary plan.

- p. **The City of Bowie**—In a letter dated June 20, 2014 (Robinson to Hewlett), the City of Bowie provided comment on the CSP, as follows:

At its meeting on April 21, 2014, the Bowie City Council conducted a public hearing on the proposed revision to CSP-06002 for the Melford property. As originally proposed to the City, the CSP revision included up to 100,000 square feet of retail; up to 260,000 square feet of employment; 126,520 square feet of research space; and up to 2,500 dwelling units (including up to 500 senior adult multifamily units, 1,500 non-senior multifamily units, and 500 townhome units). After hearing from 14 speakers who expressed their views on the proposal, the City Council voted to approve the CSP for Melford Village, but determined that the residential component should be revised to include up to 1,000 senior multifamily units (which may include assisted living facility units), up to 1,000 non-senior multifamily units, and up to 500 townhome units. The Council believes that this change will provide more opportunities for seniors, reduce the high number of market rate multifamily units, and generate less traffic overall. With the conditions set forth below, the City Council finds that the CSP for Melford Village will meet the findings for approval set forth in the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance.

The City Council recommends APPROVAL of the CSP revision submitted by St. John Properties on December 12, 2013 (and amended through subsequent revisions dated April 1, 2014) and the April 15, 2014 Design Guidelines revision, with the following conditions:

- (1) A development agreement shall be executed to ensure the provision of both market rate workforce and affordable senior housing units in the project, prior to acceptance of the CSP by Prince George's County. The statement in St. John Properties' March 31st transmittal that the Affordable Dwelling Units (ADUs) will be provided prior to the issuance of the 1,500th building permit shall be replaced with a statement in the development agreement that guarantees that the units will be provided in each of the defined project residential phases of the project.

The above condition is a private agreement that was reached between the applicant and the City of Bowie. This condition was met prior to submission of the subject CSP. No Planning Board action regarding the above condition is necessary.

- (2) A pedestrian connection, designed according to the CSP Streetscape Design Standards, shall be constructed between the Melford Boulevard/Science Drive roundabout and Kendale Lane in the Kenilworth section, prior to the issuance of the building permit for the 300th dwelling unit, subject to the approval of the Maryland State Highway Administration.

The site will be subject to Council Bill CB-2-2012 at the time of preliminary plan. At that time, the applicant will be required to submit a bicycle and pedestrian impact statement (BPIS), and the applicant's responsibility for off-site improvements will be determined.

Nevertheless, as the applicant has agreed to this City of Bowie condition, the CSP and the design guidelines shall be revised to graphically show the conceptual location of the envisioned pedestrian connection. Also the provision of this connection and the timing of its implementation has been brought forward as a condition of approval.

- (3) An analysis of the levels of service associated with the Melford Boulevard/ Science Drive traffic roundabout shall be submitted by the applicant, their successors or assigns, prior to the issuance of a building permit for the 1,500th dwelling unit and that the applicant, its successors and/or assigns is responsible for making all related improvements.

At the time of the preliminary plan, the applicant shall reevaluate the intersection of Melford Boulevard/Science Drive to determine what improvements will be needed at various phases of the proposed development. Timing for the construction of those necessary improvements will be evaluated at that time.

- (4) St. John Properties shall implement traffic calming measures along Belair Drive between MD 3 and Kenhill Drive, including four (4) or more locations for traffic calming devices, prior to the issuance of any residential building permits for Melford Village. The applicant, its successors and/or assigns shall be made responsible for all traffic calming improvements noted above.

The above-described portion of Belair Drive is a City of Bowie roadway that is approximately 1.15 miles in length and is located on the west side of Crain Highway (MD 3), across MD 3 from the subject property. The applicant has stated on the record that they intend to fully comply with the above recommendation. They have proffered to do this improvement. This is an agreement between the applicant and the City of Bowie.

- (5) To ensure that the residential component is balanced, the number of townhouse units included in the development shall be restricted to a maximum of 20%. The developer may exceed the 20% limitation subject to approval of any required variance to Section 27-547, footnote 7, at the time of Detailed Site Plan review.

The Planning Board concurs with the intent of the above recommendation. However, the townhouse restriction is a requirement of Section 27-547(b), Footnote 7, of the Zoning Ordinance. Because the townhouse restriction applies to the subject site and is required by the Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Board found that a finding to this effect is sufficient and no further condition is necessary.

13. As required by Section 27-276(b)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance, the conceptual site plan will, as approved with the conditions below, represent a most 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.
14. Section 27-276(b)(4) of the Zoning Ordinance provides the following required finding for approval of a conceptual site plan:

(4) The plan shall demonstrate the preservation and/or restoration of the regulated environmental features in a natural state to the fullest extent possible.

The regulated environmental features on the subject property have been preserved and/or restored to the fullest extent possible based on consistency with the limits of disturbance shown on the previously approved CSP-06002 and TCPI-044-98-02. The impacts proposed on the current application are consistent with prior approved impacts.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Subtitle 27 of the Prince George's County Code, the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission adopted the findings contained herein and APPROVED the Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI-44-98-04), and further APPROVED Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06002-01 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. The proposed development shall be limited to a mix of uses where the trip cap associated with the uses within the boundary of CSP-06002-01 shall not exceed 4,441 AM and 4,424 PM peak hour trips. Any development with an impact beyond that identified hereinabove shall require a revision to the conceptual site plan with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities.
2. Prior to certificate of approval of the conceptual site plan (CSP), the following revisions shall be made, or information shall be provided:
 - a. Verify the square footages of the existing development within the area of the CSP. Correctly note the existing and proposed square footages and floor area ratio based on the net tract area.
 - b. Add a note to the Site Data chart on Sheet 4 that all detailed site plans must show conformance to the specific allowed floor area ratios.
 - c. Revise the CSP to graphically show the conceptual location of the proposed pedestrian connection between the Melford Boulevard/Science Drive roundabout and Kendale Lane in the Kenilworth section of Bowie.
 - d. Revise General Note 4 and the CSP to clearly indicate the range of square footage for each use within the boundary of the CSP.

- e. Designate the retail area west of Melford Boulevard for retail, institutional, or office uses.
 - f. Correct the notations on the CSP to include the following text “Melford and Cemetery Environmental Setting (Historic Site 71B-016).”
 - g. Revise CSP Sheets 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 of 13 to show the 150-foot-wide floodplain buffer correctly.
 - h. Indicate the location of a “conservation easement” that is required for the 150-foot-wide floodplain buffer on Sheet 13 of 13.
 - i. Revise the subject CSP boundary to include all of the properties that were the subject of Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06002. Publicly-owned properties not subject to zoning do not need to be included in the boundary of CSP-06002-01.
3. Prior to certificate of approval of the conceptual site plan (CSP), the Melford Village Design Guidelines (Guidelines) shall be revised as follows:
- a. References to departures, variances, or variations should be modified or clarified, as necessary, to avoid conflicts with Zoning Ordinance procedures.
 - b. Label each appendix section clearly as an appendix.
 - c. Move the parking ratio table and shared parking adjustment table, and all associated language, to an appendix. Add an opening statement regarding the purpose, as described in Finding 7e above, to be reviewed by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.
 - d. Move the Definitions section to an appendix and add an opening statement regarding the purpose, as described in Finding 6 above, to be reviewed by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.
 - e. Move the Design Review Committee Policies & Procedures section to an appendix and add an opening statement regarding the purpose, as described in Finding 6 above, to be reviewed by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.
 - f. A note shall be added to the Street Sections section (page 19) indicating that it shows conceptual street sections that are subject to final approval with the preliminary plan of subdivision.
 - g. Provide language at the bottom of the Street Sections section on page 19 to state that the appropriateness of shared lane markings (sharrows) will be evaluated at the time of preliminary plan of subdivision subject to the approval of the City of Bowie.

- h. Remove the reference to a parking space size in the Parking Standards section.
 - i. Revise the maps within the Guidelines to maintain consistency with the CSP, as necessary.
 - j. Amend the landscape design guidelines to state that “Residential landscaping shall be provided in accordance with Section 4.1 of the Prince George’s County Landscape Manual.”
 - k. Amend the landscape design guidelines to reflect that street trees along private streets should be located between the street curb and the sidewalk in conformance with the Prince George’s County Landscape Manual, and meet the minimum soil surface area requirements contained in the Prince George’s County Landscape Manual.
 - l. Amend the landscape design guidelines on page 51 to reflect that landscaping in parking areas should be designed to conform to the Prince Georges County Landscape Manual.
4. At the time of preliminary plan of subdivision, the following issues shall be addressed, or information shall be provided:
- a. Reevaluate the intersection of Melford Boulevard and Science Drive to determine what improvements will be needed at various phases of the proposed development.
 - b. Provide an updated letter from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Wildlife and Heritage Division, concerning the presence of rare, threatened, and/or endangered species on the site as an amendment to the updated natural resources inventory (NRI) prior to approval.
 - c. If impacts to regulated environmental features are proposed at the time of preliminary plan, over and above those previously approved by the Planning Board, a statement of justification shall be submitted in accordance with Section 24-130 of the Subdivision Regulations. The justification shall address how each impact has been avoided and/or minimized and shall include 8.5 by 11 exhibits of the proposed disturbance.
 - d. The preliminary plan application package shall contain a copy of the erosion and sediment control concept plan.
 - e. Evaluate the provision of a circulator shuttle bus service or route throughout Melford, to/from adjacent or nearby employers, commuter bus lots, and future stations and/or mass transit.
5. Except for previously approved clearing that directly relates to the construction of the stormwater management ponds, all disturbances to the stream and floodplain buffers shall be eliminated. Where buffers have been disturbed by previous approvals, they shall be reforested wherever

possible. The Type I tree conservation plan associated with the preliminary plan of subdivision will be evaluated for impacts to these buffers for the installation of stormwater management outfalls, as necessary. The 150-foot building setback shall be shown on the plans, and the applicant shall adhere to the setback.

6. During the review of the Type I tree conservation plan associated with the preliminary plan of subdivision, the linear wetland in the middle of the southeastern portion of the site shall be evaluated to ensure its protection in a manner consistent with previous approvals.
7. Prior to approval of a preliminary plan of subdivision or detailed site plan, the applicant shall demonstrate:
 - a. The development plans shall show minimization of impervious surfaces, through all phases of the project, with the use of permeable paving surfaces in accordance with the approved storm water management concept plan for Melford. Structured parking should be used to the maximum extent reasonably practicable.
 - b. The required 100-foot natural buffer for streams and the 150-foot buffer for the 100-year floodplain shall be retained in an undisturbed or restored state to the fullest extent possible, except for impacts approved by the Planning Board. Master-planned trails and connectors to the master plan trail from interior trail networks shall be allowed subject to minimization of impacts.
 - c. Clearing for utility installation shall be minimized, especially in environmentally-sensitive areas, and clearing for utilities in those areas shall be coordinated, to minimize ground or buffer disturbance. Woodland disturbed for that purpose shall be reforested, in cooperation with the appropriate utility.
 - d. The open space system, including but not limited to environmentally-sensitive areas, shall extend through the site and shall link the different uses. Portions of the open space system shall be visible to and accessible from public streets.
8. All stream channels on the site shall be depicted on all plans in their entirety, with the regulated stream buffer shown as required.
9. At the time of detailed site plan (DSP), the following design issues shall be addressed:
 - a. The plans shall show the stormwater management ponds as amenities, with gentle natural slopes and extensive native planting.
 - b. Prior to the approval of any detailed site plan that includes a portion of the Melford and Cemetery Environmental Setting, in consultation with archeology staff, the applicant shall provide for additional public interpretation of the significance of archeological findings within the property. That public interpretation may take the form of on-site signage, a

printed brochure, public lectures or a website. The location and wording of any additional signage, brochure text, or website shall be subject to approval by the Prince George's County Planning Department staff archeologist.

- c. The proposed lighting system shall use full cut-off lighting systems, with limited light spill-over.
 - d. Applicable DSPs that may affect the historic vista of the Melford and Cemetery Historic Site (71B-016) shall demonstrate that any portion of a proposed building either partially or fully within the designated view corridors established in Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06002-01 comply with the height requirements for buildings within the view corridors set forth in the design guidelines.
 - e. Prior to approval of any DSPs that include any portion of the Melford and Cemetery Historic Site (71B-016) environmental setting and impact review area, the applicant shall demonstrate that the scale, mass, proportion, materials, and architecture for new construction in the proposed northwest and southwest neighborhoods appropriately relate to the character of the historic site.
10. Detailed site plans shall provide a minimum 30-foot-wide landscaped buffer between the development and John Hanson Highway (US 50/301) if research and development flex space is proposed. The buffer shall be measured from the public utility easement.
 11. At the time of detailed site plan, the private on-site recreational facilities within the area of each DSP shall be reviewed. The following issues shall be addressed:
 - a. The applicant shall provide a final list of proposed private recreational facilities and their cost estimates. The list of facilities provided on page 15 of the conceptual site plan design guidelines shall initially be viewed as the types of facilities required. The appropriateness of the number and size of the facilities will be reviewed at DSP.
 - b. The minimum size of the proposed private recreational facilities and the timing of their construction shall be determined.
 - c. The developer and the developer's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall satisfy the Prince George's County Planning Board that there are adequate provisions to assure retention and future maintenance of the proposed recreational facilities.
 12. Before approval of a detailed site plan for any retail uses, the plans shall demonstrate that the retail uses are designed to:
 - a. Create a sense of place by, among other techniques, creating a design focused upon a village or main street theme; providing amenities such as plazas, parks, recreational

opportunities, entertainment and cultural activities, public services, and dining; and providing attractive gateways/entries and public spaces.

- b. Create outdoor amenities to include, at a minimum, such amenities as brick pavers, tree grates, decorative lighting, signs, banners, high-quality street furniture, and extensive landscaping, including mature trees.
- c. Create attractive architecture by using high-quality building materials such as stone, brick, or split-face block, and providing architectural elements such as façade articulation, dormer windows, canopies, arcades, varied roofscapes, and customized shopfronts to create a street-like rhythm.
- d. Provide attractive quality façades on all commercial buildings visible from public spaces and streets; and completely screen loading, service, trash, HVAC (heating, ventilating, and air conditioning), and other unsightly functions.
- e. Create a retail area where pedestrians may travel with ease, with attractive walkways and continuous street-front experiences, to maximize the quality of the pedestrian environment. All uses shall be connected by sidewalks; crosswalks shall run through and across the parking lots and drive aisles, to connect all buildings and uses; sidewalks shall be wide, appealing, shaded, and configured for safe and comfortable travel; pedestrian walkways shall be separated from vehicular circulation by planting beds, raised planters, seating walls, and on-street parallel parking or structures; walking distances through parking lots shall be minimized and located to form logical and safe pedestrian crossings; and walkways shall be made more pedestrian-friendly through the use of arcades, canopies, street trees, benches, and tables and chairs.
- f. Screen parking from the streets, and ensure that attractive buildings and signage are visible from the streets.
- g. Minimize the expanse of parking lots through the use of shared parking, structured parking or decks, or landscape islands.
- h. Provide a hierarchy of pedestrian-scaled, high-quality, energy-efficient, direct and indirect lighting that illuminates walkways, ensures safety, highlights buildings and landmark elements, and provides sight lines to other retail uses.
- i. Provide a comprehensive sign package for signs and sign standards that integrate the signage guidelines within Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06002-01 and the previously approved sign standards contained in Detailed Site Plan DSP-11008. The standards shall address size, location, square footage, materials, and lighting. Any revision to existing approved signage plans shall incorporate the previously approved designs. The revised signage plan to consolidate the signage standards and remove inconsistencies may be approved by the Planning Director, as designee of the Planning Board.

- j. Eliminate all temporary signage on the site or attached to the exterior façades of a building.
 - k. Make retail pad sites compatible with the main retail/office/hotel/residential component. If the retail pad sites are located along the street, all off-street parking shall be located to the rear or side of the pad sites. Parking provided on the side of pad sites shall be buffered with appropriate screening and/or landscape features.
 - l. Provide green areas or public plazas between pad sites, where reasonably practicable.
 - m. Ensure that restaurants have attractive outdoor seating areas, with views of public spaces, lakes, or other natural features, where reasonably practicable.
13. All plans shall delineate and note both the environmental setting and the impact area for Melford and Cemetery, Historic Site 71B-016.
14. Prior to Planning Board approval of the first detailed site plan for development in the northwest or southwest neighborhood of Melford Village, the applicant in the historic area work permit process shall submit a plan and timetable for the protection, stabilization, restoration, and planned adaptive use of the buildings and gardens of the Melford and Cemetery Historic Site. The Historic Preservation Commission shall review and approve the plan and timetable through the Historic Area Work Permit (HAWP) process.
15. In the detailed site plan for the development of the Melford Historic Site (71B-016), its outbuildings, and its cemetery, the proposed development shall be compatible in scale, design, and character with the existing historical and architectural character of the buildings. Sensitive and innovative site design techniques, such as careful siting, variation in orientation, roof shape, building materials, screening, landscaping, berming, and open space, should be incorporated into the proposal to minimize adverse impacts to the historic site.
16. Prior to approval of any preliminary plan of subdivision or detailed site plan applications, the Historic Preservation Section shall certify that all quarterly reports have been received in a timely manner and that the Melford site is being properly maintained.
17. The applicant shall provide standard sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads, in keeping with Guideline 3 of Prince George's County Council Resolution CR-11-2006. In areas of high pedestrian activity, wide sidewalks shall be required where reasonably appropriate, unless modified by the City of Bowie for portions of sidewalk within the public right-of-way.
18. Curb extensions, curb cuts, crosswalks, pedestrian refuges, and other pedestrian safety features shall be provided where appropriate, and shall be shown on all affected detailed site plans.

19. Connector trails shall be provided to complement the sidewalk network and provide access between uses and development pods. Priority shall be given to providing trail and sidewalk access to the existing trail around the lower pond. The comprehensive trail network will be evaluated at the time of preliminary plan of subdivision and should be in conformance with Guidelines 29 and 30 of Prince George's County Council Resolution CR-11-2006.
20. The illustrative plan provided with the conceptual site plan (CSP) is for illustrative purposes only and does not reflect the final layout for any purpose, including limits of disturbance. The CSP may be used as a guide for the layout to be reviewed with the preliminary plan of subdivision or detailed site plans, but its proposed development should be modified, where development shown in the CSP is not consistent with environmental or other master plan considerations.
21. No additional research and development flex space is permitted in the Mixed Use–Transportation Oriented (M-X-T) Zone at Melford.
22. Recreation Facilities Conditions:
 - a. The applicant shall complete construction of a ten-foot-wide asphalt surface hiker/bicyclist/equestrian trail, four boardwalks, a 15-space asphalt parking lot, an asphalt access road, and trailhead facilities on adjacent Patuxent River Park prior to issuance of a building permit for the 500th residential dwelling unit within the Melford development.
 - b. Prior to the first residential building permit, the applicant shall submit to the Prince George's County Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) for review and approval revised construction drawings for public recreational facilities. These drawings shall include details for construction of the planned asphalt parking lot and asphalt access road.
 - c. The applicant shall construct at least two eight-foot-wide asphalt trail connectors from the residential neighborhood to the master-planned trail on dedicated parkland. The location of the trail connectors shall be established at the time of detailed site plan review and approval.
 - d. The applicant shall submit to the Prince George's County Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) a performance bond, letter of credit, or other suitable financial guarantee, in an amount to be determined by DPR, at least two weeks prior to issuance of a building permit for the 100th residential dwelling unit within the Melford development.
 - e. Prior to a submission of any final plat of subdivision for the residential component of Melford, the public Recreational Facilities Agreement (RFA) recorded at Liber 34304, Folio 145 shall be amended to incorporate an asphalt parking lot and asphalt access road to the park, timing of construction, and bonding of the recreational facilities. Upon DPR approval, the RFA shall be recorded among the Land Records of Prince George's County, Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

- f. The applicant shall allocate appropriate and developable areas for the private recreational facilities on the homeowners association land. The private recreational facilities shall include playgrounds for children of all ages. The private recreational facilities shall be reviewed by the Urban Design Section of the Development Review Division for adequacy and property siting, prior to approval of the detailed site plan by the Planning Board.
23. A pedestrian connection, designed according to the CSP Streetscape Design Standards, shall be constructed between the Melford Boulevard/Science Drive roundabout and Kendale Lane in the Kenilworth section, prior to the issuance of the building permit for the 300th dwelling unit, subject to the approval of the Maryland State Highway Administration.

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 Washington, seconded by Commissioner Geraldo, with Commissioners Washington, Geraldo and Bailey voting in favor of the motion, with Commissioner Shoaff opposing the motion, and with Commissioner Hewlett recused at its regular meeting held on Thursday, November 13, 2014, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 4th day of December 2014.

Patricia Colihan Barney
Executive Director

By Jessica Jones
Planning Board Administrator