

## R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board has reviewed A-10009 requesting rezoning from E-I-A, R-E and R-R Zones to the L-A-C Zone in accordance with Subtitle 27 of the Prince George's County Code; and

WHEREAS, after consideration of the evidence presented at the public hearing on May 28, 2009, the Prince George's County Planning Board finds:

- A. **Location and Field Inspection:** The subject property consists of four deed parcels located in the northwest and southwest quadrants of the intersection of Steed Road and Piscataway Road (MD 223), including a 0.46-acre property on the southeast side of Piscataway Road. The site is developed with a small general aviation airport (Washington Executive Airport "Hyde Field"). Significant portions of the site on both sides of Steed Road have been mined for sand and gravel through the years and are partially reclaimed. There are several wooded stream courses in the central and western portions of the site; they are tributaries to Tinkers Creek to the west. The small parcel across Piscataway Road is developed with a nonconforming commercial use.
- B. **History:** The subject property is a portion of the larger Hyde Field development approved via A-9667 in 1991 for an expanded airport employment park with up to 4.6 million square feet of industrial and employment uses. For a detailed history of the planning activities on this site, refer to Section F of this report.
- C. **Master Plan Recommendation**
- 2002 General Plan:** The subject site is located in the Developing Tier. The vision for the Developing Tier is to maintain a pattern of low- to moderate-density suburban residential communities, distinct commercial centers, and employment areas that are increasingly transit serviceable. Goals, policies, and strategies for planning and development in the Developing Tier are discussed below in Section F of this report.
- Master Plan:** The 1993 *Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Subregion V, Planning Areas 81A, 81B, 83, 84, 85A and 85B* recommends employment-industrial, suburban estate/low-density planned neighborhood; and low-suburban residential land uses for the subject property. Further discussion of the master plan including the ongoing 2009 Preliminary Subregion V Master Plan can be found in Section F of this report.
- D. **Request:** The applicant seeks to rezone the site to the R-M and L-A-C ones. This project would consist of residential and commercial land uses with retail and office commercial and higher-density residential uses focused on the intersection of Steed Road and Piscataway Road and medium-density residential on the remainder of the property. The small Parcel 80 across

Piscataway Road is also proposed for commercial uses. These varying land use types require numerous separate access points oriented to both Piscataway Road and Steed Road.

The proposed basic plan reflects the following land use types and quantities:

Gross Tract: 423.91 acres  
Floodplain: 5.69 acres  
Net Tract: 418.22 acres

**Hyde Field I: A-10009 (L-A-C)**

Gross Tract: 90.14 acres  
Floodplain: 0.00 acre  
Net Tract Area: 90.14 acres

PROPOSED COMMERCIAL AREA: 46.15 acres  
Base intensity of zone 46.15 acres at 0.16 FAR: 321,647 sq ft.  
Maximum intensity 46.15 acres at 0.31 FAR: 623,191 sq ft.

Proposed Land Use Types and Quantities:  
Retail Commercial, Office Commercial

PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL AREA: 43.99 acres  
Base density 43.99 at 8.0 du/acre: 351 units  
Maximum density 43.99 at 12.1 du/acre: 532 units  
Proposed number of units: 368 units

Proposed Land Use Types and Quantities:

Multifamily

E. **Surrounding Uses:** The property is surrounded by the following uses:

North— A PEPCO right-of-way, beyond which are single-family residences along Glen View Drive in the R-R Zone.

East— Across Piscataway Road are single-family residences, agricultural fields and markets, and a church in the R-R Zone.

South— Agricultural fields and pasture land in the E-I-A Zone with scattered single-family residences including the Mary-Catherine Estates subdivision in the R-R Zone.

West— Undeveloped land and agricultural fields in the R-R Zone.

F. **Zoning Requirements:** Section 27-195(b) Criteria for approval.

- (1) **Prior to the approval of the application and the basic plan, the applicant shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the District Council, that the entire development meets the following criteria:**
  - (A) **The proposed Basic Plan shall either conform to:**
    - (i) **The specific recommendation of a General Plan map, Area Master Plan map, or urban renewal plan map; or the principles and guidelines of the plan text which address the design and physical development of the property, the public facilities necessary to serve the proposed development, and the impact which the development may have on the environment and surrounding properties; or**
    - (ii) **The principles and guidelines described in the Plan (including the text) with respect to land use, the number of dwelling units, intensity of nonresidential buildings, and the location of land uses.**

The comments from the Community Planning Division (referral dated March 3, 2008) go into great detail about the vision of the 2002 *Prince George's County Approved General Plan*. These comments are noted below:

The **1974 Subregion V Master Plan** recommended the Hyde Field property for development as part of a new town center and adjoining suburban living areas near the Piscataway Road-Steed Road intersection in the Tippett Community. This master plan also recommended construction of a Southeast Freeway extending from the District of Columbia through the Hyde Field property (with an interchange at Piscataway Road) and south into Charles County. The 1974 master plan also included a proposal for construction of an Outer Beltway with an interchange for the Southeast Freeway just south of the Tippett area near Floral Park Road.

The **1979 Accokeek, Tippett and Piscataway Sectional Map Amendment (SMA)** (approved by CR-125-1979 on December 4, 1979) interpreted and implemented the recommendations of the 1974 Subregion V Master Plan for these three planning areas. This SMA rezoned 197 acres of the current Hyde Field property from the R-R to the E-I-A Zone by approval of rezoning requested by application A-9142 as part of the SMA in Comprehensive Design Zone Amendment 1. This E-I-A Zone was approved for creation of an airport-oriented employment park with airport support services and business. Maximum development was identified

as 1,245,000 square feet floor area, but only 310,000 square feet was allowed in a first stage “until construction funds for the widening of Piscataway Road to four lanes are contained within the adopted six-year State Highway Administration Construction Program.” (See Condition 4, p. 15, CR-125-1979) The other portions of the current Hyde Field property and most of the Tippet area were rezoned from the R-R to the R-A Zone as part of a “staged future development area” policy established by the 1979 SMA.

The **1982 General Plan** recognized the Hyde Field airport-employment park as classified in the E-I-A Zone area as a major employment area. The surrounding area in the Tippet community was identified as a “Category II Policy Area— Staged Future Development, Large-lot Area, and/or Agricultural Area...” (See 1982 General Plan Map) More significantly, however, the 1982 Master Plan of Transportation approved with the General Plan formally deleted the proposed Southeast Freeway and the Outer Beltway from the county plan for transportation facilities and designated MD 5 (F-9 freeway) and MD 210 (E-5 expressway) as the primary north-south transportation routes in southern Prince George’s County. Thus, instead of being located at a major interchange along a planned freeway corridor, Hyde Field and the Tippet area became the distant middle ground between two existing arterial highways miles to the east and west that were recommended for improvements to serve regional freeway/expressway transportation functions.

**Washington Executive Airport Rezoning Application A-9667-C**—In the late 1980s, Washington Executive Airport (Hyde Field) was identified as a General Aviation Reliever Airport under the regional airport system (similar to Montgomery Airpark in upper Montgomery County). Rezoning application A-9667-C (approved June 4, 1991) reclassified 458 acres from the E-I-A Zone (including the 197 acres as previously approved via A-9142) and the R-A Zone (261 acres) to the E-I-A Zone. A new basic plan was approved for development of an improved and expanded airport employment park with a relocated longer runway as the center piece, i.e., from the existing 3,000 feet up to 4,800 feet to accommodate larger general aviation aircraft including small jets. Although up to 4.6 million square feet of floor area for commercial and industrial development related to the new airport was envisioned, again approval limited development to a Phase I of no more than 250,000 square feet of floor area in the first six years (with minor improvements to local roads) and up to 1.2 million square feet with more substantial improvements to the then planned road system. Development beyond 1.2 million square feet (up to 3.8 million square feet) was precluded until adequate transportation facilities could be identified in the then pending master plan for Subregion V (See A-9667-C, Zoning Ordinance No. 23-1991, Condition 6). The approved 1993 Subregion V master plan recommends new local roads that, when built, would provide adequate access to the Tippet community for development of the Washington Executive Airpark, e.g. A-65 (Old

Fort Road Extended) and C-514 (Surratts Road Extended).

### **THE 1993 MASTER PLAN FOR SUBREGION V**

The 1993 master plan for Subregion V identifies a community structure composed of three corridor suburban communities (Clinton, Brandywine, and Accokeek) that are located along the MD 5 and MD 210 major transportation routes, one interior suburban community without direct access to these major highways (Tippett), and three rural living areas adjacent to the corridor suburban communities at the periphery of the county (West Accokeek/Moyaone, Piscataway/Danville, and Cedarville). Higher densities and intensities are encouraged in the corridor communities close to the major highways, lower densities and rural land use patterns are recommended for interior communities and rural area. In addition to the desire to retain community character in these areas, lower residential densities were recommended partly due to access and mobility concerns stemming from decisions in the 1982 General Plan and Master Plan of Transportation to remove major planned roads in this area.

Specifically, the 1993 master plan recommends employment-industrial land use for the portion of these applications west of Steed Road, consistent with the Washington Executive Airport redevelopment proposal approved by the District Council two years earlier and the SMA retained the existing E-I-A Zone. The application properties east of Steed Road and south of MD 223 were recommended for low-density residential land uses and were classified in the R-E and R-R Zones, respectively.

### **Master Plan Employment Land Use**

The 1993 master plan recommends employment areas in each of the suburban living areas throughout the subregion, primarily along major transportation corridors, but with some exceptions based on historical development decisions. Hyde Field is one of the exceptions due to the location of the airport which is identified as Employment Area H—Washington Executive Airport Employment Area for redevelopment as a 458-acre airport-oriented industrial employment area. Between 250,000 to 3.8 million square feet of gross leasable area (GLA) of airport related industrial uses were to be developed contingent on the construction of adequate highway facilities. The master plan recommendations for employment areas anticipated up to 8,000 employees (text, p. 93).

The impending demise of the Hyde Field airport signaled by these applications removes the rationale for master plan recommendations regarding any significant employment activity at this interior suburban community location and appropriate alternative land uses need to be determined.

### **Master Plan Residential Land Use**

Residential land use in the Tippett community, where these applications are

located, is generally recommended for low-density suburban development at average densities of up to 2.6 dwelling units per acre toward the Clinton community and large-lot or planned neighborhood development at up to 1.5 dwelling units per acre to the southwest. The Zoning Ordinance allows higher densities for a planned retirement community in some circumstances, such as in the Bevard North Subdivision (4-05049), located somewhat south of these applications, although the overall density for this project is comparable at 2.96 dwelling units per acre.

The residential development pattern recommended by the 1993 master plan estimated approximately 7,200 total dwelling units for the Tippett community (text, p. 93); these applications could add approximately 2,372 additional dwelling units. In 1991, approximately 2,100 dwelling units existed in the Tippett community. As of 2007, approximately 3,500 dwelling units had been built and nearly 2,400 additional dwelling units had been approved for subdivision and development, yielding a total of approximately 5,900 existing and approved pipeline dwelling units in the Tippett community. It is estimated that approximately 2,800 dwelling units could be developed on properties that have not submitted development applications, assuming the low-density residential development pattern currently in place (approximately 1.0–1.5 dwelling unit/acre) is continued. Including the higher residential density (6–8 dwelling unit/acre) requested by these applications would increase the potential for additional new dwelling units by approximately 1,700 more dwelling units, i.e. to 4,500 units. Thus, at full development, the Tippett community could contain approximately 10,000 dwelling units or about one-third more than anticipated by the 1993 master plan. (Source: 2009 Preliminary Subregion V Master Plan data). It should be noted that if these rezoning requests are approved, additional increases in residential density and development may be difficult to deny for adjacent properties, especially for the 80-acre remainder of the Washington Executive Airport proposal in the E-I-A Zone that is not included with these applications.

In lieu of development at Hyde Field as an industrial park, residential development consistent with the density and character already planned for the Tippett community is a logical choice. Given the large size of the property, there is an opportunity to establish a well-planned neighborhood that complements the Tippett community consistent with characteristics advocated by the master plan (text, p. 40–41) which include providing a range of residential densities and types, employment areas, commercial areas to serve nearby residence and employees, park and recreation facilities, and public facilities.

Comprehensive design zones such as the R-M and L-A-C Zones provide the design flexibility to develop a more complete residential neighborhood consistent with master plan concepts. These neighborhoods provide a distinct identity from typical subdivisions, integrated with commercial and recreation use, having a

range of lifestyles, ages, housing types and incomes, and a more efficient use of land than is typical of single-family suburban sprawl subdivisions.

However, the R-M and L-A-C Zones requested by these applications would interject a large residential component into the Tippett community at a substantially greater density than contemplated for this community in the 1993 approved master plan. For example, the 1993 master plan concept for employment development would have generated substantial vehicle peak-hour trips, but in a reverse directional flow relative to the existing traffic pattern of bedroom community commuters traveling out of neighborhoods to major highway routes in the morning and returning in the evening. The residential units proposed in these applications would add to directional peak-hour traffic on MD 223, compounding congestion and elevating the importance of planning **and implementing** transportation system improvements prior to more development. Alternatively, residential development potential could be reduced to the lowest reasonable levels to minimize these impacts. Until there is a comprehensive assessment of transportation and other facility impacts and means to address them assured, maintaining low densities is most appropriate. Revising the applications to request a lower-density comprehensive design zone, such as the Residential Suburban Development (R-S) Zone would be more appropriate and justifiable.

#### **Master Plan Commercial Land Use**

The 1993 master plan recommends a distribution of large and small commercial activity centers based “on the relationship of the activity center to residential development it is intended to serve.” (Plan text, p. 56) A village local activity center is recommended in the vicinity of the Piscataway Road-Steed Road intersection, to both capitalize on the proposed non-retail employment-industrial market and to ease the Tippett communities’ reliance on existing commercial development in Clinton or elsewhere. The master plan further explains the recommendation for a village activity center as follows (p. 93):

**As recommended residential development occurs in the Tippett area, a shopping center including a grocery store or supermarket will become justified and should become the nucleus for development of an activity center. Due to the low residential densities recommended for the Tippett area as a whole, only one “village” level center will be justified by local market support. As a new center, it should be designed in full compliance with the concepts advocated for activity centers, and relationships to surrounding residential developments should be very carefully designed.**

The various levels of activity centers correspond to the L-A-C and Major Activity Center (M-A-C) Comprehensive Design Zones in the Zoning Ordinance and are intended to include a mix of commercial, residential, and public uses that are

specifically described in the master plan text (pp. 56–57, See Attachment 1 for summary). The village activity center is described as follows:

**Village Activity Center: 10 to 20 acres overall size. (This level is recommended for Tippett)**

- Contains 4 to 15 acres of commercial development (40,000 to 150,000 square feet GLA with an average 0.23 FAR).
- Could contain between 10 to 15 dwelling units per gross residential acre.
- Serves a population of about 15,000 people (5,172 DU at 2.9 persons/DU)
- Has a service radius of about 1.5 miles in radius.
- Anchored by a supermarket and should also include a restaurant/fast-food/carry-out, clothing store, card store, drug store or florist, in addition to uses described in a neighborhood center.
- Include a bank and liquor store, in addition to those uses listed for convenience centers (e.g., dairy store, dry cleaners, video store, small fast-food establishment) and the like.
- May include medical, professional, financial and technical offices and other office activities.
- Should include some of the following uses a day care center, recreational uses and public facilities such as educational facilities, a post office or a health clinic.
- In Subregion V, new village activity centers should be designed around a public plaza that functions like a traditional town square.

Application A-10009 requests the neighborhood level Local Activity Center (L-A-C) Zone for approximately 90 acres and proposes from 350,000 to 609,147 square feet of commercial development and 368 dwelling units. Clearly this application **does not conform** to the recommendations of the master plan for commercial activity center development at the village level. However, a LAC proposal composing substantially less commercial development and lower residential density would conform to recommendations of the master plan for commercial development in this area.

### **THE 2002 GENERAL PLAN FOR PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY**

The 2002 General Plan for Prince George's County reoriented broad countywide policies for planning and development based on a development pattern of three policy tiers, centers, and corridors. As noted in other sections of this memorandum, the Hyde Field applications are located in the Developing Tier, but are **not** located in or near a designated center or corridor. The General Plan vision for the **Developing Tier** is to maintain a pattern of low- to moderate-density suburban-residential communities, distinct commercial centers, and employment areas that are increasingly transit serviceable. The vision for **centers** is mixed residential and nonresidential uses at moderate to high densities and intensities, with a strong emphasis on transit-oriented development. The vision for **corridors** is mixed residential and nonresidential uses at moderate to high densities and intensities, with a strong emphasis on transit-oriented development. This development should occur at local centers and other appropriate nodes within one-quarter mile of major intersections or transit stops along the corridor. There is a clear distinction between the scale and orientation of development recommended in designated centers or corridors and that in the Developing Tier.

The text of the Basic Plan for these applications addresses compliance with each of the goals, policies, and strategies for the Developing Tier section of the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern Element (pp. 16–29). The applicant makes the case, and the Board agrees, that on a large site, such as the subject property, a compact, planned neighborhood, promoting “a greater mix of uses and housing choices in neighborhoods and communities focused around human-scale, mixed-use centers accessible by multiple transportation modes, is supported by General Plan policies and strategies.

### **General Plan Residential Development Policies**

Tippett is developing and has been planned as a low-density suburban community consisting predominantly of single-family detached residential subdivisions and, more recently low-density planned neighborhoods, including some townhouses and multifamily units. The highest average density approved for any development project in Tippett is less than three dwelling units per acre. A large development project proposing approximately six to eight dwelling units per acre average is a substantial departure from the anticipated character of this community. This level of residential density on such a large property is **not in conformance** with residential development policies or the intended character for the Tippett community as described by the 1993 master plan, which is identified as an interior suburban community that is not appropriate for the higher levels of density recommended for communities located along the MD 5 and MD 210 corridors. As such, the General Plan Developing Tier goals to “maintain low- to moderate-density land uses (except in Centers and Corridors)” and to “reinforce existing suburban neighborhoods.” (General Plan text, p. 37 and Basic Plan text, p. 18–19) should be interpreted to mean maintaining the low-density character in

the Tippett community. With respect to other sections of the 2002 General Plan, the Housing Element states:

**Goal: Enhance the quality and character of residential neighborhoods through the planning and provision of high-quality mix of residential development that provides a choice of housing types...Policy 1, Strategy I...Discourage higher-density housing in areas outside of Centers, Corridors and mixed-use areas in the Developing and Rural Tiers.** (General Plan text, pp. 78–79)

The upper category of the R-M Zone (5.8–7.9) does not equate to low-density land use; revising application A-10017 to request an R-S Zone would be more consistent with these General Plan policies.

#### **General Plan Commercial Development Policies**

With respect to commercial development, the General Plan includes the following goals, policies and strategies:

**Goal: Encourage quality economic development at appropriate locations to increase employment opportunities, income and the tax base within Prince George’s County**

...

**Policy 2: Retain and enhance the county’s existing businesses...Strategy V. Ensure that land use, development review, and other policy decisions support the retention and growth of existing businesses.**

**Policy 3: Increase the number of upper income, high value-added jobs in the county...Strategy VIII, Ensure that adequate amounts of properly zoned land area available for economic development activities while avoiding overzoning that encourages sprawl and inhibits revitalization efforts.** (Economic Development Element, p. 75-77)

**Discourage new isolated commercial activities and promote new commercial development primarily in designated Centers and Corridors. Encourage the revitalization and redevelopment of existing, underutilized commercial areas.** (Developing Tier Policy 1, Strategy III, p. 37)

The basic plan acknowledges that these applications are not located in or near a designated center or corridor. It further states that the proposal creates a “unique commercial node that provides services, employment, and shopping for area residents. These residents currently travel into Clinton and the 301 Corridor to

shop for groceries and other basics. Location of a well planned integrated community retail center in the midst of all this planned and approved residential development furthers the goal of avoiding isolated commercial activity and counteracts the traffic congestion caused by these underserved residents.” (Basic Plan text, p. 22)

Discussion under the Economic Development Goal states that the “General Plan identifies Centers and Corridors that should be the cornerstones for attracting new employment and commercial development. Further, the plan’s public facilities and transportation recommendations help support future economic development, as well as create and maintain strong communities. Finally, it is important to realize that it is not enough to attract new development on previously undeveloped land; a strategic component of this economic development goal is the retention and maintenance of existing businesses.” (General Plan text, p. 75)

Regarding the commercial component of the L-A-C Zone requested by application A-10009:

A **neighborhood shopping center** (as defined by the 2006 edition of the ULI Dollars and Cents of Shopping Centers and referenced in the applicants market study, pp. 11–12) that is anchored by a supermarket and provides convenience goods and personal services to the evolving community in Tippett clearly **conforms with policies** of both the 1993 master plan and the 2002 General Plan. A neighborhood shopping center as defined by ULI is comparable to the village local activity center terminology used in Prince George’s County and is recommended in the Tippett community.

#### **2009 PRELIMINARY MASTER PLAN FOR SUBREGION V (Pending Public Hearing and Planning Board Adoption)**

Policies of the 2002 General Plan provide goals, concepts, and guidelines for an ongoing master planning effort to update and revise the 1993 Subregion V master plan. A 2009 Preliminary Subregion V Master Plan and SMA was published on February 27, 2009 for a public hearing scheduled March 31, 2009, at 7:00 pm in the County Administration Building in Upper Marlboro. It is anticipated that this proposed master plan will be approved by the District Council by the Fall of 2009.

Since approval of the Washington Executive Airport E-I-A Zone in 1991, the Hyde Field airport has continued to operate and extensive mining activity has taken place on the site, but none of the anticipated employment area development has occurred. Legal challenges, property ownership changes, real estate economic cycles, the 9/11 terrorist attacks, and the resulting restrictions on the use of airspace around the Washington DC area have combined to prevent redevelopment of Hyde Field as an expanded airport-employment park. The submittal of these applications for residential and commercial development

essentially concludes the effort to refurbish this airport and removes any rationale for a large industrial employment area at this location.

Cognizant of the history of Washington Executive Airport, the pending Hyde Field rezoning applications, the relative location of the Tippet community and the challenges related to implementing the master plan transportation recommendations (encountered in all of the previous rezoning applications for this area), the 2009 Preliminary Subregion V Master Plan recommends Residential Low-density land use and a Local Activity Center (commercial and residential) for the Hyde Field property. The preliminary Subregion V SMA recommendation is to reclassify the Hyde Field properties from the E-I-A to the R-E Zone consistent with the predominant adjacent zoning and development pattern in the Tippet community. Comprehensive design zone applications such as these should be reviewed by the Planning Board before being proposed in an SMA (Section 27-223(b)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance) to determine whether the requested L-A-C or R-M Zones should be approved within the SMA as proposed, with modifications, or denied. Key issues to be addressed are the proposed density and intensity of the applications, the interpretation of master plan and General Plan goals, policies and strategies, the transportation needs of the area and mechanisms to ensure that needed transportation facilities will be provided.

#### **TRANSPORTATION ISSUES**

Hyde Field is located roughly midway between the MD 5 and MD 210 highway corridors that provide primary access to the Capital Beltway (I-95/495) and the Branch Avenue Metro Station which, in turn, provide access to employment centers to the north, west, and east. The adequacy of transportation facilities to access these major routes from within the Clinton and Tippet communities, particularly relative to proposals for future development, is one of the most pressing issues in the new Subregion V master plan. Due to geography and the lack of other alternatives, MD 223 is the primary corridor for access in and out of the area. From the Hyde Field applications, travel options are:

**To MD 5**—At present, access from this area to/from MD 5 is limited to MD 233 to the east, or local county roads intersecting with MD 223, e.g., Steed Road, Temple Hills Road, or Old Branch Avenue which lead to Coventry Way or MD 337 (Allentown Road) and MD 5 interchanges located farther north.

**To MD 210**—Access to MD 210 north from MD 223 is limited to Steed Road to Allentown Road then south to Old Fort Road or north to Tucker Road and Palmer Road to reach intersections on MD 210 or to go farther north to interchanges along I-95 at MD 414.

**To I-95**—Access to I-95 is limited to interchanges at MD 5, MD 210, or MD 414 St. Barnabas Road.

**To the Branch Avenue Metro Station**—Access to the metro station is primarily from MD 5 or Auth Road via MD 337 Allentown Road. A bus is available at the Park and Ride stop located at MD 5 and Woodward Road.

2002 General Plan policies and strategies for transportation in the Developing Tier (pp. 38) emphasize:

- Provision of multiple modes of travel to reduce need for new arterial and collector roads,
- Ensuring that road capacity improvements proposed outside Centers and Corridors support the desired development pattern;
- Assigning a higher priority for public improvements that offer alternatives to automobile travel, and
- Encouraging private sector financial support of the transportation system to accommodate the preferred development pattern.

The basic plan text for these applications does not satisfy the policies above in detail, instead observing that there will be multiple modes of travel and connections on-site and off-site to the extent possible; there could be a bus stop (or park and ride); required road improvements to the intersection of Piscataway and Steed Roads and to other failing off-site critical intersections which have not been identified. Presumably, the other road improvements will be addressed later in the development review process, e.g. at site plan and preliminary subdivision after the zoning has been granted. However, prior to granting any approval of these applications, which have transportation impacts that are substantially different than contemplated in the 1993 master plan, a more detailed analysis is needed and specific road improvements should be ensured.

Both the 1993 approved master plan and the proposed 2009 preliminary master plan recommend improvements to existing roads and propose new roads needed to serve development in the Tippett area where Hyde Field is located. According to the transportation model analysis for the preliminary 2009 master plan, the proposed land use pattern and the proposed transportation system will provide adequate levels of service when built over the next 20 or more years. For testing purposes, the residential density and commercial intensity proposed by these applications was included. Regardless, an effective mechanism to ensure the proposed road system will be built (even in stages) in stages that will allow further development and provide or restore adequate service levels has not been defined. Critical roads needed for these applications in the Tippett community are:

#### **EXISTING ROADS PLANNED FOR IMPROVEMENT:**

**A-54 (MD 223—Piscataway Road)** is located along the southeast boundary of these applications. Master Plan Table 13, Proposed Highway Network (Plan text, pp. 116–118) states:

- a. Between MD 210 in Accokeek to Temple Hill Road in Clinton (including along the frontage of the subject property), MD 223 is planned as a four-to six-lane divided arterial roadway.

**Status**—A two-lane road with turning lanes at intersections.

- b. From Temple Hill Road to MD 5, MD 223 is identified as a State Highway Administration (SHA) Study Corridor and is planned as a six- to eight-lane divided arterial roadway.

**Status**—A two-lane road to Gwynndale Drive and a four-lane road to MD 5 with turning lanes at intersections. An SHA Development and Evaluation Planning Study (STIP Reference PG5811) to reconstruct this section to address congestion is in the FY 09-14 Consolidated Transportation Program (CTP), but no additional money is budgeted for engineering, right-of-way acquisition, or construction in this six-year CTP.

**C-516 (Steed Road)** is located through these applications northwest of Piscataway Road and is planned as a four-lane collector road; it currently exists as a two-lane road.

**Status**—A two-lane road with turning lanes at intersections.

**I-501 (Proposed C-518)** is recommended as a new two-lane industrial internal access road between MD 223 and Steed Road.

**Status**—To be built by the developer when the employment-industrial park develops.

#### **PROPOSED NEW ROADS TO BE CONSTRUCTED:**

**C-514 (Surratts Road Extended)** is recommended as a new four-lane collector road on an alignment southeast of the Steed Road/MD 223 intersection to connect with C-609 (Surratts Road) at Brandywine Road and farther east to MD 5. The Subregion V master plan states that C-514 will be “needed for the ultimate development of Employment Area ‘H,’ and will serve traffic desiring a bypass of Clinton. Later need associated with latter stages of development of Tippett and Employment Area ‘H.’”(Plan text, p. 125)

**Status**—Not built. A significant portion of property needed for right-of-way is in public ownership (Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) and Prince George’s Community College), but additional right-of-way through privately owned properties is needed. There are no current plans for additional right-of-way acquisition or construction.

**A-65 (Old Fort Road Extended)** is proposed as a new four- to six-lane arterial road from an intersection on Piscataway Road just south of Hyde Field as follows:

- a. Northwest to existing Old Fort Road across Tinkers Creek in order to provide a more effective connection to MD 210. (Note: The 2009 Preliminary Subregion V Master Plan proposes to reclassify this segment to a four-lane major collector road C-703)

**Status**—Most of the northwest section is to be dedicated and built (including a bridge over Tinkers Creek) with two to four lanes by approved development proposals along its route. Old Fort Road from Tinkers Creek to Allentown Road is currently built to collector road standards to accommodate four lanes by approved development projects in Tippett. West of Allentown Road, Old Fort Road is a two-lane road with turning lanes to an at-grade, signal-controlled intersection at MD 210. Widening Old Fort Road and building an interchange at MD 210 are not programmed for construction.

- b. Southeast across Piscataway Creek to provide a connection to MD 5.

**Status**—Most of the northwest section is to be dedicated and built (including a bridge over Tinkers Creek) with two to four lanes by approved development proposals along its route. Old Fort Road from Tinkers Creek to Allentown Road is currently built to collector road standards to accommodate four lanes by approved development projects in Tippett. West of Allentown Road, Old Fort Road is a two-lane road with turning lanes to an at-grade, signal-controlled intersection at MD 210. Widening Old Fort Road and building an interchange at MD 210 are not programmed for construction.

The southeast section has some segments of the needed right-of-way reserved or to be dedicated as part of approved subdivisions. Construction across these approved development projects has not been required in all cases. Acquisition of additional needed right-of-way, construction of roadway, and the bridge over Piscataway Creek are not funded by public or private sources.

Incremental improvements to the existing road system have been made by the development community as projects are approved and built, and there is a commitment from a recently approved development project to build a leg of A-65 that will connect to Old Fort Road for more direct access to MD 210, as well as improve a critical intersection in Clinton. It is understood that these proposed improvements accommodate just approved development and little more. Moreover, there is little additional commitment by developers in Subregion V or public funding to improve the existing two-lane segment of Old Fort Road to Indian Head Highway, to build A-65 southeast of MD 223 to connect to MD 5, or to build C-615 to Surratts Road and MD 5. All of these roads are critical to serve development of the Tippett community.

According to cost estimates in the 2009 Preliminary Master Plan for Subregion V (pp. 254–255), improving the existing roads (MD 223 and Steed) will cost approximately \$63 million dollars and construction of the new roads (Old Fort Road Extended and Surratts Road Extended) will cost approximately another \$60 million. Due to current regulations and development approvals already made, the public sector will be responsible for most of these costs, contrary to General Plan policies. Until there are effective mechanisms in place to ensure that these major road improvements (or alternatives) will be made prior to or concurrent with development, approvals for development projects that increase demands on existing facilities should be avoided.

As indicated above, a large amount of funding will be needed to improve the transportation infrastructure in this area. In the foreseeable future, it appears unlikely that the public sector will be able to allocate funds from current sources to construct these roads. The applicant indicates they wish to work with county officials to participate in finding solutions to the transportation dilemmas in this area. A balance of firm commitment to stage transportation improvements and mechanisms to achieve necessary funding with substantial participation from the development community is needed.

**(B) The economic analysis submitted for a proposed retail commercial area adequately justifies an area of the size and scope shown on the Basic Plan.**

A market study submitted with the basic plan indicates that there is market support for a fairly large retail commercial center (350,000 square feet GLA or more) including both convenience-retail and shoppers-comparison goods as well as some offices. This conclusion is based on analysis of a trade area slightly larger than the Tippett community which estimates existing development (4,920 dwelling units), anticipated residential growth (3,799 dwelling units—most of it approved in the development pipeline) and includes 2,213 dwelling units proposed by this application. The Planning Board finds that the applicant's proposal for

approximately 220,000 to 270,000 square feet is justified by the submitted economic analysis.

- (C) **Transportation facilities (including streets and public transit) (i) which are existing, (ii) which are under construction, or (iii) for which 100 percent of the construction funds are allocated within the adopted County Capital Improvement Program, within the current State Consolidated Transportation program, or will be provided by the applicant, will be adequate to carry the anticipated traffic generated by the development based on the maximum proposed density. The uses proposed will not generate traffic which would lower the level of service anticipated by the land use and circulation systems shown on the approved General or Area Master Plan, or urban renewal plans.**

The Transportation Planning Section, in their referral dated March 4, 2009, analyzed the transportation impacts of this proposal:

**Growth Policy—Service Level Standards**

The subject property is located within the Developing Tier, as defined in the *Prince George's County Approved General Plan*. As such, the subject property is evaluated according to the following standards:

**Links and signalized intersections:** Level-of-Service (LOS) D, with signalized intersections operating at a critical lane volume (CLV) of 1,450 or better. Mitigation, as defined by Section 24-124(a)(6) of the Subdivision Regulations, is permitted at signalized intersections within any tier subject to meeting the geographical criteria in the guidelines.

**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 to be 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.

**Review of the Request**

The applicant has provided a traffic study for review with this application. That study is based upon older counts, and for that reason it has not been reviewed in detail or referred to SHA and DPW&T. It is anticipated that future comprehensive design plan and preliminary plan of subdivision applications will be accompanied by a traffic study that will be reviewed with greater detail, and that degree of

detail is more appropriate for those applications. The study should examine the site impact at the following locations:

MD 223 and Temple Hill Road (signalized)  
MD 223 and Steed Road (signalized)  
MD 223 and Tippett Road (unsignalized)  
Steed Road and collector site access (future)  
Steed Road and Allentown Road (signalized)  
MD 223 and Bevard East/North access (future)  
MD 223 and Windbrook Drive (unsignalized)  
MD 223 and Old Branch Avenue/Brandywine Road (signalized)  
Allentown Road and Old Fort Road North (unsignalized)  
MD 210 and Old Fort Road North (signalized)

Additionally, the study should examine the links of MD 223 between Floral Park Road and Steed Road, Windbrook Drive between MD 223 and Floral Park Road, and Tippett Road between Thrift Road and MD 223.

The site is currently zoned E-I-A, R-E, and R-R. The major portion of the site was rezoned as Washington Executive Airpark in 1991 under Zoning Map Amendment A-9667-C. There is a traffic memorandum appended to the justification statement which states that approvals are in place for the development of up to 1.2 million square feet of employment and/or institutional uses, with an increase by the District Council to 3.8 million square feet upon consideration of the development plan as a part of the master plan process.

#### **Comparison of Existing Zoning with Proposal**

It is noted that the *Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Subregion V, Planning Areas 81A, 81B, 83, 84, 85A, and 85B* makes provision for “gross leasable floor area (GLA) up to as much as 3.8 million square feet GLA if adequate highway facilities are provided.” Therefore, it is determined that the master plan does make allowance for the development of up to 3.8 million square feet within the area of A-9667-C. The E-I-A portion of the subject application is 365.42 acres, or 79.79 percent of the original A-9667-C application. The traffic memorandum makes appropriate use of this information and determines that this applicant’s portion of the E-I-A potential is 3.032 million square feet.

The mix of space within this E-I-A zoning is a critical part of making a traffic comparison. The traffic memorandum assumes that the E-I-A space is 12 percent office and 88 percent warehouse. This matches the employment mix assumed when the 1993 master plan was done, as documented in the “Subregion V Technical Bulletin (Transportation).” It also very closely matches the use mix of 35 percent light industrial space and 65 percent warehouse space that was assumed in the traffic study for the Washington Executive Airpark case.

Based on the applicant's revision to the overall application, the traffic comparison was revised. While previous comparisons have assumed 350,000 square feet within the L-A-C, it is stated that the maximum square footage within the L-A-C is assumed to be 405,000 square feet. This probably should have been incorporated into earlier versions of this table since the nonresidential proposal for the L-A-C has not materially changed. Of this amount, 80,000 square feet is assumed as office, and the remainder as retail. This analysis also assumes the upper limit of R-S combined with higher residential density within the L-A-C. This is a reduction from the 2,372 units proposed initially, and in the following table the entire reduction is taken from the single-family detached units. Using this information, the following table has been prepared to summarize the trip generation comparison of the existing zoning with the proposed zoning, in consideration of the following assumptions:

- Trip generation rates for the various uses are as published in the "Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals (Guidelines)."
- Retail assumes a 50 percent trip reduction for pass-by traffic (i.e., traffic that is already on the adjacent roadways) in accordance with the Guidelines.
- No other trip reductions are assumed.

<b>AM, PM, and Daily Trip Comparison of Proposed Zoning with Existing Zoning</b>										
<b>Zone</b>	<b>Quantity</b>	<b>Unit</b>	<b>Use Type</b>	<b>AM Peak Hour</b>			<b>PM Peak Hour</b>			<b>Daily</b>
				<b>In</b>	<b>Out</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>In</b>	<b>Out</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Total</b>
E-I-A	365.6	acres								
	3,032,000	square ft	total							
	363,840	square ft	general office	655	73	728	127	546	673	6185
	2,668,160	square ft	warehouse	1841	454	2295	454	1841	2295	12807
R-E	58	acres								
	58	residences	single fam det	9	35	44	34	18	52	522
<b>Existing</b>		<b>potential trip generation</b>		<b>2505</b>	<b>562</b>	<b>3067</b>	<b>615</b>	<b>2405</b>	<b>3020</b>	<b>19514</b>
L-A-C/R-M	424	acres								
	405,000	square ft	total							
	80,000	square ft	general office	144	16	160	28	120	148	1360
	325,000	square ft	retail	97	62	159	520	520	1040	11375
	2,058	residences	total							
	962	residences	single fam det	144	577	721	568	298	866	8658
	758	residences	single fam att	106	424	530	394	212	606	6064
	338	residences	multifamily	34	142	176	132	71	203	2197
<b>Proposed</b>		<b>potential trip generation</b>		<b>525</b>	<b>1221</b>	<b>1746</b>	<b>1642</b>	<b>1221</b>	<b>2863</b>	<b>29654</b>
<b>Comparison of Proposed Versus Existing Zoning</b>				<b>-1980</b>	<b>659</b>	<b>-1321</b>	<b>1027</b>	<b>-1184</b>	<b>-157</b>	<b>10140</b>

As documented above, the site would generate over 10,000 more daily trips with the rezoning. More notably, the rezoning would result in approximately 650 more outbound AM peak hour trips and more than 1,000 additional inbound PM peak hour trips. This represents a sizable increase in the typical commuting travel pattern from this area to other areas.

As a part of the update of the Subregion 5 Master Plan, the Transportation Planning Section has modeled the transportation network within the subregion study area. As a part of this work, a “base case” situation was developed using existing zoning and existing transportation recommendations. Also, a “recommended plan” situation was developed using proposed transportation recommendations with the land use recommendations in the updated plan, **except** that the requested zone for the Hyde Field site was modeled. In the vicinity of this site, the transportation network recommendations stayed nearly the same; the major change was the change of Hyde Field from a primarily employment zone to a primarily residential and retail zone. Note that all roadways are analyzed as four-lane roadways except MD 223 east of A-65 (six lanes) and Tippet Road (two lanes). The following table highlights the changes between the “base case” and the “recommended plan” as measured by average daily traffic (ADT):

<b>Comparison of Average Daily Traffic (ADT) on Master Plan Roadways With Existing Zoning (Base Case) And Proposed Zoning (Recommended Plan)</b>				
Roadway Link	Base Case		Recommended Plan	
	ADT	LOS	ADT	LOS
MC-703 (Old Fort Road Extended) from MD 210 to Tinkers Creek	33,000	D	32,100	D
MC-703 (Old Fort Road Extended) from Tinkers Creek to MD 223	30,400	C	27,000	C
A-65 (Old Fort Road Extended) from MD 223 to Thrift Road	24,700	C	22,100	B
A-54 (MD 223, Piscataway Rd) from Floral Park Rd to Windbrook Dr	16,200	B	19,100	B
A-54 (MD 223, Piscataway Rd) from Windbrook Dr to A-65	20,300	B	20,800	B
A-54 (MD 223, Piscataway Rd) from A-65 to Steed Rd	21,600	A	27,100	B
A-54 (MD 223, Piscataway Rd) from Steed Rd to Temple Hill Rd	28,500	B	32,000	B
A-54 (MD 223, Piscataway Rd) from Temp Hill Rd to Brandywine Rd	28,600	B	30,000	B
A-54 (MD 223, Woodyard Rd) from Brandywine Rd to MD 5	37,800	C	39,700	C
C-516 (Steed Road) from MD 223 to Allentown Road	16,400	C	22,100	D
C-718 (Allentown Road) from Old Fort Road to Steed Road	14,100	B	13,100	B
C-718 (Allentown Road) from Steed Road to Tucker Road	20,700	C	22,100	D
Tippett Road from MD 223 to Thrift Road	1,200	A	1,200	A
MC-500 (Temple Hill Road) from MD 223 to Kirby Road	12,300	A	13,300	A
C-515 (Temple Hill Road Extended) from MD 223 to C-514	3,200	A	3,700	A
C-514 (Surratts Road Extended) from MD 223 to C-515	5,200	A	5,600	A
C-514 (Surratts Road Extended) from C-515 to Brandywine Road	8,900	B	9,700	B

From the information presented in the above table, the changes between the “base case” and the “recommended plan” are not significant, and they do not result in transportation link failures with the realization of the entire transportation network and the zoning in the area. Keep in mind that “recommended plan” includes the rezoning of the subject property as initially requested (2,372 residences). Given this information, it is determined that the rezoning as requested would not lower the level-of-service anticipated by the master plan.

**Transportation Adequacy and Staging Issues**

Because of the number of transportation issues in the area, a key issue for this case involves the staging of the needed transportation improvements. Based on past

approvals in the area of this rezoning, the following facilities would experience failing traffic operations if this rezoning were to be approved:

- The intersection of MD 210 and Old Fort Road North
- The intersection of MD 223 and Old Branch Avenue/Brandywine Road
- The intersection of MD 223 and Temple Hill Road
- The intersection of MD 223 and Steed Road
- The two-lane link of MD 223 between Tippett Road and Old Branch Avenue/Brandywine Road
- The four-lane link of MD 223 between Old Branch Avenue/Brandywine Road and MD 5
- The two-lane link of Steed Road between MD 223 and Allentown Road

In response to Commission concerns, the applicant has clarified the intent to address the roadway concerns in the area. A traffic analysis has been submitted which largely confirms the concerns noted above. The traffic analysis notes the following:

- Transportation mitigation in accordance with Section 24-124(a)(6) can be accomplished at the intersection of MD 210 and Old Fort Road North.
- The intersection of MD 223 and Old Branch Avenue/Brandywine Road can be improved to achieve LOS D in both peak hours. This improvement is a part of an overall widening of MD 223 from the site to MD 5.
- The intersection of MD 223 and Temple Hill Road would be improved as a part of overall widening of MD 223 from the site to MD 5.
- The intersection of MD 223 and Steed Road would be improved as a part of overall widening of MD 223 from the site to MD 5.
- The two-lane link of MD 223 between Tippett Road and Old Branch Avenue/Brandywine Road would be widened to four lanes. This widening would involve on-site frontage improvements as well as off-site link and intersection improvements.
- The four-lane link of MD 223 between Old Branch Avenue/Brandywine Road and MD 5 would be widened to six lanes. This widening would involve off-site link and intersection improvements.
- The two-lane link of Steed Road between MD 223 and Piscataway Creek would be widened as a result of on-site frontage improvements. Also, this applicant understands that the link of Old Fort Road Extended between existing Old Fort Road and MD 223 is needed to provide improved access to MD 210. For this connection to be effective for this site, the east-west collector across the site must be completed to connect to the MC-703 facility.

In addition to the improvements listed above, it appears likely that either Surratts Road Extended between MD 223 and Brandywine Road (C-514) or the A-65

facility between MD 223 and MD 5 will need to be constructed in order to augment MD 223 and provide a reasonable travel alternative for trips between the subject site and the Brandywine/Waldorf areas.

### **Review of Basic Plan**

The site is adjacent to existing MD 223, which along the site's frontage is a master planned arterial facility (A-54). Steed Road along the property's frontage is a master planned collector facility (C-516). Adequate right-of-way consistent with master plan recommendations must be dedicated along the property's frontage when development is initiated through the preliminary plan process.

The basic plan proposes that the I-501 facility shown on the current master plan be upgraded to a collector facility across the site. This is consistent with the preliminary master plan, which recommends a collector facility, C-518, be constructed east-west across the subject property between Steed Road and MC-704 (Old Fort Road Extended).

The basic plan shows an additional collector near the northwestern end of the site connecting to adjacent property to the west. As a collector facility, this roadway would have a very limited function beyond the limits of this site. This smaller collector should be shown as a primary roadway.

The access shown on the basic plan is a significant issue that requires clarification. While to some extent access issues can be deferred until later stages of review, the basic plan displays access points, and if the basic plan regulates later stages of development, the following issues need greater understanding:

1. It appears that each access point along Steed Road would involve public streets, and Subtitle 24 of the County Code does not regulate access to collectors in any regard. However, two of the access points are shown for right-in/right-out operation. Given that the master plan does not foresee a median for Steed Road, these access points should be shown as more generic arrows on the basic plan.
2. The function of MD 223 as an arterial roadway should be preserved to the extent feasible. Therefore, it causes concern that three driveways are shown on the basic plan between Tippet Road and Steed Road. Elsewhere in the statement of justification, this applicant speaks of utilizing service roadways along MD 223, a concept which is more consistent with Section 24-121 of the Subdivision Regulations and more appropriate for use along an arterial roadway. The basic plan shall include a note to indicate access points along MD 223 shall be subject to analysis and consolidation/deletion at later stages of review unless service roadways and public streets are used.

This information is provided for purposes of establishing a record and allowing comment upon the scope of future studies as a part of this process. If the zoning is granted, detailed transportation conditions will be imposed at the time of the comprehensive design plan (CDP) and the preliminary plan applications.

### **Conclusions**

Based on the preceding findings, the Planning Board concludes that existing transportation facilities and those to be provided by the applicant will be adequate to carry the anticipated traffic generated by the development based on the maximum proposed density. Furthermore, the uses proposed will not generate traffic which would lower the level-of-service anticipated by the land use and circulation systems shown on the approved area master plan, in accordance with Section 27-195 of the Prince George's County Code, if the application is approved with recommended conditions.

- (D) Other existing or planned private and public facilities which are existing, under construction, or for which construction funds are contained in the first six years of the adopted County Capital Improvement Program (such as schools, recreation areas, water and sewerage systems, libraries and fire stations) will be adequate for the uses proposed.**

As indicated in the referral replies below, other public facilities are generally considered to be adequate for the uses proposed.

In a memo dated April 20, 2007, the Public Facilities Planning Section submitted the following comments:

#### **Fire and Rescue Service**

The existing fire engine service at Allentown Road Fire/EMS Station, Company 32, located at 8907 Allentown Road, has a service travel time of four minutes, which is beyond the 3.25-minutes travel time guideline.

The existing paramedic service at Clinton Fire/EMS Station, Company 25, located at 9025 Woodyard Road, has a service travel time of six minutes, which is within the 7.25-minutes travel time guideline.

The existing ladder truck service at Allentown Road Fire/EMS Station, Company 32, located at 8907 Allentown Road, has a service travel time of four minutes, which is within the 4.25-minutes travel time guideline.

The above findings are not in conformance with the *Guidelines for the Analysis of Development Impact on Fire and Rescue Facilities*. In order to alleviate the negative impact on fire and rescue services due to the inadequate services discussed, an automatic fire suppression system shall be provided in all new buildings proposed in this subdivision, unless the Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department determines that an alternative method of fire suppression is appropriate.

#### **Police Facilities**

The 2002 General Plan addresses the provision of public facilities that will be needed to serve existing and future county residents. The plan includes planning guidelines for police and they are:

Station space per capita: 141 square feet per 1,000 residents

The police facilities test is done on a countywide basis in accordance with the policies of the Planning Board. There are 267,660 square feet of space in all of the facilities used by the Prince George's County Police Department and the latest population estimate is 825,520. Using the guideline of 141 square feet per 1,000 residents, 116,398 square feet of space for police is needed. The current amount of space, 267,660 square feet, is above the guideline. The proposed development is within the service area for Police District IV, Oxon Hill.

#### **School Facilities**

The applicant's request for zoning change does not definitively list the number of residential units. Residential developments are reviewed during the subdivision process for compliance with County Council Bill CB-31-2003 which establishes a school facilities surcharge in the amounts of: \$7,000 per dwelling if a building is located between I-95/495 and the District of Columbia; \$7,000 per dwelling if the building is included within a basic plan or conceptual site plan that abuts on an existing or planned mass transit rail station site operated by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority; or \$12,000 per dwelling for all other buildings. Council Bill CB-31-2003 allows for these surcharges to be adjusted for inflation and the current amounts are \$7,412 and 12,706 to be paid at the time of issuance of each building permit. The school surcharge may be used for the construction of additional or expanded school facilities and renovations to existing school buildings or other systemic changes.

#### **General Plan/Master Plan Recommendations**

The 1993 Subregion V approved master plan recommends construction of an elementary school on county-owned land in the Mary Catherine Estates subdivision approximately 1.4 miles southwest of the subject property. There are no master-planned public facilities on, or adjacent to, the subject property.

The applicant is proposing to provide a portion of the subject property for this use.

### **Conclusion**

The existing or programmed public facilities are adequate to serve the proposed rezoning request.

- (E) Environmental relationships reflect compatibility between the proposed general land use types, or if identified, the specific land use types, and surrounding land uses, so as to promote the health, safety and welfare of the present and future inhabitants of the Regional District.**

### **Access and Circulation**

The site is adjacent to existing MD 223, which along the site's frontage is a master planned arterial facility (A-54). Steed Road along the property's frontage is a master planned collector facility (C-516). Adequate right-of-way consistent with master plan recommendations must be dedicated along the property's frontage when development is initiated through the preliminary plan process.

The basic plan proposes that the I-501 facility shown on the current master plan be upgraded to a collector facility across the site. This is consistent with the preliminary master plan, which recommends a collector facility, C-518, be constructed east-west across the subject property between Steed Road and MC-704 (Old Fort Road Extended).

The basic plan shows an additional collector near the northwestern end of the site connecting to adjacent property to the west. As a collector facility, this roadway would have a very limited function beyond the limits of this site. This smaller collector should be shown as a primary roadway.

The access shown on the basic plan is a significant issue that requires clarification. While to some extent access issues can be deferred until later stages of review, the basic plan displays access points, and if the basic plan regulates later stages of development, the following issues need greater understanding:

1. It appears that each access point along Steed Road would involve public streets, and Subtitle 24 of the County Code does not regulate access to collectors in any regard. However, two of the access points are shown for right-in/right-out operation. Given that the master plan does not foresee a median for Steed Road, these access points should be shown as more generic arrows on the basic plan.

2. The function of MD 223 as an arterial roadway should be preserved to the extent feasible. Therefore, it causes concern that three driveways are shown on the basic plan between Tippet Road and Steed Road. Elsewhere in the statement of justification, this applicant speaks of utilizing service roadways along MD 223, a concept which is more consistent with Section 24-121 of the Subdivision Regulations and more appropriate for use along an arterial roadway. The basic plan shall include a note to indicate access points along MD 223 shall be subject to analysis and consolidation/deletion at later stages of review unless service roadways and public streets are used.

This information is provided for purposes of establishing a record and allowing comment upon the scope of future studies as a part of this process. If the zoning is granted, detailed transportation conditions will be imposed at the time of the comprehensive design plan (CDP) and the preliminary plan applications.

#### **Applicable Regulations**

The project is subject to Subtitle 27, Zoning Part 8, Comprehensive Design Zones, Division 2. Specific Comprehensive Design Zones, Subdivision 5, R-M Zone (Residential Medium Development) of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance apply, including, use list, regulations, general standards and public benefit features and density increment factors, and minimum size exceptions for the district.

#### **Landscape Manual Conformance**

If the proposal for rezoning is approved, the project will be subject to certain sections of the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*. These include Sections 4.1 Residential Requirements, 4.3 Parking Lot Requirements, 4.4 Screening Requirements, 4.5 Stormwater Management Facility Requirements, and 4.6 Buffering Residential Development from Streets. Although Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, does not technically apply in comprehensive design zones, staff uses the requirements of that section as a guide in evaluating buffering between what would be considered incompatible uses under the Landscape Manual. The compatibility issues with surrounding uses, both interior and exterior to the development, will be examined at the time of the comprehensive design plan.

#### **Design guidelines**

At time of comprehensive design plan, design standards and guidelines regarding basic style/design, finishing material, and color for buildings and signage should be established for review and approval of specific design plan.

### **Environmental Review**

The Environmental Planning Section, in a memorandum dated July 30, 2008, provided the following additional comments, which the Planning Board now adopts as findings for the reasons stated:

In the approved master plan and sectional map amendment for Subregion V (September 1993), the Environmental Envelope section contains guidelines for future development. The following guidelines have been determined to be applicable to the current project. The text in **BOLD** is the text from the master plan and the plain text provides comments on plan conformance.

- 1. An open space and conservation network, based on existing soil conditions, slopes, watercourses, vegetation, natural ecological features, and estimated future population needs, should be established and maintained.**

Implementation of the *Approved Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan* will ensure compliance with this guideline. The basic plan proposes conservation areas that will protect the already regulated stream valleys and tracts of contiguous woodland in conformance with the Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan. All of the required woodland conservation for the proposed development should be located on-site.

- 2. Developers shall be encouraged to utilize the Comprehensive Design Ordinance, the cluster provisions and site plan review provisions of the subdivision regulations and other innovative techniques that ensure responsible environmental consideration.**

The application proposes using the Comprehensive Design Ordinance.

- 3. Land dedicated in accordance with the subdivision regulations for the provision of needed recreational facilities should not consist solely of floodplains or other parts of the Natural Reserve Area.**

This issue will be addressed by the Department of Parks and Recreation.

- 4. The responsibility for environmentally sound development practices should apply equally to private and public interests; decisions concerning the selection and use of properties should be based on environmental considerations.**

Section 24-130 of the Subdivision Regulations, the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance, and implementation of the Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan will focus development in an environmentally sound manner.

5. **Developers shall be encouraged to capitalize on natural assets through the retention and protection of trees, streams and other ecological features.**

The basic plan appears to propose conservation of areas that will protect the already regulated stream valleys and tracts of contiguous woodland.

6. **Woodlands associated with floodplains, wetlands, stream corridors and steep slopes shall be given priority for preservation.**

This guideline is codified in the preservation priorities of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance.

7. **To the extent practicable, large contiguous tracts of woodland should be conserved in both upland and bottomland situations in order to reduce forest fragmentation, maximize woodland interiors, and reduce the edge/area ratio.**

This guideline is codified in the preservation priorities of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance.

8. **The Natural Reserve Areas, containing floodplain and other areas unsuitable for development, should be restricted from development except for agricultural, recreational and similar uses. Land grading should be discouraged. When disturbance is permitted, all necessary conditions should be imposed.**

Future development of the property should to the extent practicable avoid impacts to sensitive environmental features. Implementation of Section 24-130 of the Subdivision Regulations will ensure that only necessary impacts to sensitive environmental features are permitted.

9. **All development proposals should provide effective means for the preservation and protection of Natural Reserve Areas, the development plans for lands containing open space and conservation areas should specify how and by whom these areas will be maintained.**

Issues needing the preservation and protection of natural reserve areas will be addressed in later stages (comprehensive design plan and preliminary plan of subdivision) of review of the development of this property.

**10. Limited development should be permitted in Conditional Reserve Areas, based on the significant physiographic constraints and natural processes of the land.**

“Conditional Reserve Areas” in master plans were superseded by the “evaluation areas” designated in the Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan in 2005. Much of the proposed development shown on the basic plan is proposed within the designated evaluation areas, which is addressed in the proposed conditions contained in this referral.

**11. In the Perceptual Liability Areas, land uses such as schools, residences, nursing homes, and libraries that are sensitive to noise intrusion, air pollution and other characteristics of excessive vehicular traffic should be protected by suitable construction techniques and by the enforcement of legally mandated standards.**

The site design will need to address future traffic-generated noise from master planned arterial A-54.

**12. Developers shall be encouraged to include careful site planning and construction techniques which are designed to reduce the adverse impact of point and nonpoint source noise that exceeds the State’s current maximum allowable levels for receiving land uses.**

The site design will need to address future traffic-generated noise from master planned arterial A-54. All residential lots will have to be designed so the outdoor activity areas are not impacted by traffic-generated noise exceeding 65 dBA Ldn and all residential structures will need to have interior noise levels of 45 dBA Ldn or less. Noise issues are further discussed in detail in the Environmental Review section below.

**13. Farming conservation measures such as diversions, terraces, and grassed waterways in conjunction with contour strip cropping and crop rotations should be implemented.**

No farming is proposed.

**14. Citizens, developers and others should be encouraged to seek current information on the area's sensitive environmental condition, and on all aspects of related regulatory systems and functional programs from the appropriate local, State and Federal agencies.**

Information available at PGATLAS.com provides generalized information regarding sensitive environmental features of the region and the natural resource inventory provides detailed information regarding the subject property.

**Conformance with the Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan**

The subject property contains substantial areas of regulated area, evaluation areas and network gaps as designated on the approved Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan. Future development of the site will have to be in conformance with this functional master plan.

**Soils**

According to the *Prince George's County Soil Survey*, the principal soils on the site are in the Aura, Beltsville, Bibb, Chillum, Croom, Howell, Iuka, Marr, Matapeake, and Sassafras series; however, portions of the site were mined for sand and gravel after the publication of the *Prince George's County Soil Survey*. Marlboro clay is not found to occur in the vicinity of this property.

Portions of this site have been mined for sand and gravel as approved by applications SE-3851 and SE-4154. These gravel pit areas are of concern. Due to the unknown nature of the soils and the limitations associated with these areas, a soils report addressing the soil structure, soil characteristics, and foundation stability needs to be submitted. The soils report is required in order to allow analysis of the site with regard to the required findings of Section 24-131 of the Subdivision Regulations. The study shall, at a minimum, clearly define the limits of past excavation and indicate all areas where fill has been placed. All fill areas shall include borings, test pits, and logs of the materials found. Borings and test pits in fill areas shall be deep enough to reach undisturbed ground.

**Natural Resources Inventory**

An approved Natural Resources Inventory, NRI/053/06, was submitted with the application. There are streams, wetlands, and 100-year floodplain on the property associated with Tinkers Creek in the Potomac River watershed. Current air photos indicate that the site is developed with an airfield and associated accessory structures. The forest stand delineation indicates five forest stands totaling 77.25 acres. Although a natural resources inventory (NRI) was not required, the information on the approved NRI is helpful in evaluating issues that will arise in

later reviews in the development process.

### **Impacts to Significant Environmental Features**

The design should avoid any impacts to significant environmental features that are required to be protected by Section 24-130 of the Subdivision Regulations unless the impacts are essential for the development as a whole. Staff will not support impacts to sensitive environmental features that are not associated with essential development activities. Essential development includes such features as public utility lines (including sewer and stormwater outfalls), street crossings, and so forth, which are mandated for public health and safety; nonessential activities are those, such as grading for lots, stormwater management ponds, parking areas, and so forth, which do not relate directly to public health, safety or welfare. Impacts to sensitive environmental features require variations to the Subdivision Regulations. Staff will generally not support impacts to sensitive environmental features that are not associated with necessary road crossings or the installation of public utilities that are required to serve the development as a whole.

### **Woodland Conservation**

The property is subject to the requirements of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance because the site has a previously approved Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/122/94, for 228.91 acres of the 423.91-acre property. A Type I tree conservation plan that accounts for all prior woodland clearing is required as part of any application for a comprehensive design plan. A revised Type II tree conservation plan will be required with any application for a specific design plan. No further action regarding woodland conservation is required for the review of this zoning map amendment.

### **Noise**

Piscataway Road is the nearest source of traffic-generated noise and is designated as an arterial in the Subregion V master plan. Section 24-121(a)(4) of the Subdivision Regulations requires that residential lots adjacent to existing or planned roadways of arterial classification or higher be platted to a minimum depth of one hundred and fifty feet and that adequate protection and screening from traffic nuisances be provided by earthen berms, plant materials, fencing, and/or the establishment of a building restriction line for new residential structures.

The noise model used by the Environmental Planning Section predicts that the unmitigated 65 dBA Ldn noise contour will be about 168 feet from the centerline of Piscataway Road in ten years.

### **Historic/Scenic Roads**

Piscataway Road is a designated scenic road. Development will have to conform

to the Department of Public Works and Transportation's publication "Design Guidelines and Standards for Scenic and Historic Roads." At a minimum, the comprehensive design plan should provide for 40-foot-wide scenic easements adjacent and contiguous to the proposed 10-foot public utility easements along the land to be dedicated for Piscataway Road. These easements can serve to preserve the scenic nature of these roads. Most of the proposed scenic easements are devoid of trees and significant landscaping will be required. The detailed landscaping will be reviewed concurrently with the Type II tree conservation plan. Page 33 of the statement of justification recognizes the need to provide buffering along Piscataway Road.

- (2) **Notwithstanding subparagraphs (C) and (D) above, where the application anticipates a construction schedule of more than six years (Section 27-179), public facilities (existing or scheduled for construction within the first six years) will be adequate to serve the development proposed to occur within the first six years. The Council shall also find that public facilities probably will be adequately supplied for the remainder of the project. In considering the probability of future public facilities construction, the Council may consider such things as existing plans for construction, budgetary constraints on providing public facilities, the public interest and public need for the particular development, the relationship of the development to public transportation, or any other matter that indicates that public or private funds will likely be expended for the necessary facilities.**

It is anticipated that the construction schedule for the proposed development will not exceed six years.

- (3) **In the case of an L-A-C Zone, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the District Council that any commercial development proposed to serve a specific community, village, or neighborhood is either:**
- (A) **Consistent with the General Plan, an Area Master Plan, or a public urban renewal plan; or**
  - (B) **No larger than needed to serve existing and proposed residential development within the community, village, or neighborhood.**

Commercial development at this site could be considered consistent with the recommendation of the 1993 Subregion V master plan which recommends a smaller activity center in the vicinity of this intersection.

**G. Conformance with the Purposes of the Zones:**

**Section 47-494(a) Purposes of the L-A-C Zone**

- (1) Establish (in the public interest) a plan implementation Zone, in which (among other things):**
  - (A) Permissible residential density and building intensity are dependent on providing public benefit features and related density/intensity increment factors; and**
  - (B) The location of the zone must be in accordance with the adopted and approved General Plan, Master Plan, or public urban renewal plan;**

**Comment:** The Planning Board believes that the residential density and the building intensity proposed for the L-A-C Zone amended by the applicant as proposed, is reasonable. We note that these applications are located in an area designated as a neighborhood activity center in the 1993 master plan, and believe the quantities and density of the remaining residential proposal are consistent with this recommendation.

- (2) Establish regulations through which adopted and approved public plans and policies (such as the General Plan, Master Plan, and public urban renewal plan for Community, Village and Neighborhood Centers) can serve as the criteria for judging individual physical development proposals;**
- (3) Assure the compatibility of proposed land uses with existing and proposed surrounding land uses, and existing and proposed public facilities and services, so as to promote the health, safety and welfare of the present and future inhabitants of the Regional District;**

The proposed densities and intensity of uses can be justified through a decrease in both commercial intensity and residential density.

- (4) Encourage and stimulate balanced land development;**

The issue of balanced development is one of the key challenges presented by this application. The process of developing a new master plan is ongoing and the applicant wishes this proposal to be judged within that context. The issues regarding the appropriate densities and scale of the commercial center could be evaluated comprehensively during the master plan process, while the multistage development process that would take place if the site was placed in the L-A-C Zone and an appropriate residential zone should allow for a balanced result.

**(5) Group uses serving public, quasi-public, and commercial needs together for the convenience of the populations they serve; and**

The plan proposes to develop a local activity center with commercial/office and retail uses which will serve the commercial needs of the existing and future residents.

**(6) Encourage dwellings integrated with activity centers in a manner which retains the amenities of the residential environment and provides the convenience of proximity to an activity center.**

The basic plan integrates residential and commercial uses within the village center. Doing so provides a level of convenience not available through conventional zoning.

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 recommends to the District Council for Prince George's County, Maryland that the above-noted application be APPROVED, subject to the following conditions:

**Proposed Land Use Types, Quantities and Conditions of Approval**

**Hyde Field I: A-10009 (L-A-C)**

Gross Tract:	90.14 acres
Floodplain:	0.00 acre
Net Tract Area:	90.14 acres

PROPOSED COMMERCIAL AREA:	29.5 acres
Base intensity of zone 29.5 acres at 0.16 FAR:	205,603 sq. ft.
Maximum intensity 29.5 acres at 0.31 FAR:	398,356 sq. ft.
Proposed maximum intensity	220,000-270,000 sq. ft.

Proposed Land Use Types and Quantities:

Retail Commercial, Office Commercial

PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL AREA:	60.14 acres
Base density 60.14 at 10 du/acre:	601 units
Maximum density 60.14 at 15 du/acre	902 units*

Proposed Land Use Types and Quantities:

Single-family detached, Single-family attached, Metropolitan, Two-family attached (two-over-two), Multifamily, Open-Space, Public uses, Recreational

\*The actual number and type of dwelling units will be determined at the time of comprehensive design plan approval after analysis of the public benefit features set forth in Section 27-509(b) of the Zoning Ordinance.

1. The application and Basic Plan shall be revised to omit the 0.5-acre property on the east side of Piscataway Road.
2. At the time of preliminary plan of subdivision, adequate right-of-way consistent with master plan recommendations shall be shown for dedication along MD 223 and Steed Road. Also, adequate right-of-way consistent with master plan recommendations shall be shown for dedication along the planned C-518 facility, as shown in the *Preliminary Subregion 5 Master Plan and Proposed Sectional Map Amendment*. the comprehensive design plan shall set an alignment for C-518 in consideration of features within the subject site and adjacent sites, and in consideration of the need to the facility to connect to MC-703.
3. At the time of comprehensive design plan, a traffic impact study shall be submitted examining, at a minimum, the following intersections:
  - a. MD 223 and Temple Hill Road (signalized)
  - b. MD 223 and Steed Road (signalized)
  - c. MD 223 and Tippett Road (unsignalized)
  - d. Steed Road and collector site access (future)
  - e. Steed Road and Allentown Road (signalized)
  - f. MD 223 and Bevard East/North access (future)
  - g. MD 223 and Windbrook Drive (unsignalized)
  - h. MD 223 and Old Branch Avenue/Brandywine Road (signalized)
  - i. Allentown Road and Old Fort Road North (unsignalized)
  - j. MD 210 and Old Fort Road North (signalized)
  - k. Additionally, the study shall examine the links of MD 223 between Floral Park Road and Steed Road, Windbrook Drive between MD 223 and Floral Park Road, and Tippett Road between Thrift Road and MD 223

This traffic study shall be used to recommend staging for the implementation of the following improvements, along with other improvements deemed necessary to meet adequacy at that time:

- a. Physical improvements needed for adequacy in accordance with Subtitle 24 at the intersection of MD 210 and Old Fort Road North.
- b. Physical improvements needed for adequacy in accordance with Subtitle 24 at the intersection of MD 223 and Old Branch Avenue/Brandywine Road.
- c. Physical improvements needed for adequacy in accordance with Subtitle 24 at the intersection of MD 223 and Temple Hill Road.
- d. Physical improvements needed for adequacy in accordance with Subtitle 24 at the intersection of MD 223 and Steed Road.

- e. The widening of the two-lane link of MD 223 between Tippett Road and Old Branch Avenue/Brandywine Road to four lanes.
  - f. The widening of the four-lane link of MD 223 between Old Branch Avenue/Brandywine Road and MD 5 to six lanes.
  - g. The completion of the two-lane link of Old Fort Road Extended (MC-703) between existing Old Fort Road and MD 223.
  - h. The completion of the collector link (C-518) from the site to Old Fort Road Extended (MC-703).
  - i. In addition to the improvements listed above, it appears likely that either Surratts Road Extended between MD 223 and Brandywine Road (C-514) or the A-65 facility between MD 223 and MD 5 will need to be constructed in order to augment MD 223 and provide a reasonable travel alternative for trips between the subject site and the Brandywine/Waldorf areas. If needed, the staging analysis should consider at least one of these new facilities in some form.
  - j. The addition of an additional through lane along Old Fort Road North between Old Fort Road South and MD 210.
4. The Basic Plan shall be revised as follows:
- a. The collector near the northwestern end of the site connecting to adjacent property to the west shall be shown as a primary roadway.
  - b. The access points along Steed Road shall be shown as more generic arrows rather than suggesting right-in right-out access. The exact operation of these access points shall be determined at the time of preliminary plan of subdivision.
  - c. The three driveways shown on the basic plan along MD 223 between Tippett Road and Steed Road shall include a note to indicate that each access shall be subject to analysis and consolidation/deletion at later stages of review unless service roadways and public streets are utilized.
5. As part of any application for a comprehensive design plan, a soils study shall be submitted. The study shall clearly define the limits of past excavation and indicate all areas where fill has been placed. All fill areas shall include borings, test pits, and logs of the materials found. Borings and test pits in fill areas shall be deep enough to reach undisturbed ground.
6. The comprehensive design plan shall avoid impacts to sensitive environmental features. If avoidance is not possible, the impacts shall be the minimum necessary to support the development concept as a whole.
7. If the information on the natural resources inventory is found later in the process to be incorrect, it shall be revised no later than 35 days prior to any Planning Board hearing on the preliminary plan.

8. The Type I tree conservation plan submitted with the comprehensive design plan shall account for all previous clearing and shall show the provision of all woodland conservation requirements on-site. Fee-in-lieu and off-site woodland conservation shall not be permitted.
9. A Phase I Noise Study shall be required as part of any application for a comprehensive design plan. The comprehensive design plan and TCP1 shall show all unmitigated 65 dBA (Ldn) noise contours associated with traffic-generated noise.
10. The comprehensive design plan and preliminary plan shall provide for a minimum 40-foot-wide scenic easement adjacent and contiguous to the proposed ten-foot public utility easements along the land to be dedicated for Piscataway Road. This easement shall not be on any residential lots.
11. The applicant shall provide:
  - a. An eight-foot-wide Class II trail along the subject site's entire road frontage of MD 223, unless modified by SHA.
  - b. Standard sidewalks along both sides of the subject site's frontage of Steed Road, unless modified by DPW&T.
  - c. Standard sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads, unless modified by DPW&T.

\* \* \* \* \*

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the action taken by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner Squire, seconded by Commissioner Vaughns, with Commissioners Squire, Vaughns and Parker voting in favor of the motion, with Commissioner Cavitt opposing the motion, and with Commissioner Clark absent at its regular meeting held on Thursday, May 28, 2009, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 18th day of June 2009.

Oscar S. Rodriguez  
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin  
Planning Board Administrator