

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Prince George’s County Planning Board has reviewed a Revision to the Special Exception for the addition of a canopy and a carport; and

WHEREAS, after consideration of the evidence presented at the public hearing on January 6, 2005, the Prince George’s County Planning Board finds:

A. Location and Field Inspection: The subject property is located on the west side of Hampton Park Boulevard approximately 390 feet south of Central Avenue (MD 214), known as 33 Hampton Park Boulevard. The subject property is developed with an existing hotel. Access to the property is via two driveways along Hampton Park Boulevard. The applicant is proposing a canopy and porte-cochere along the front of the property.

B. Development Data Summary

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone(s)	I-1	I-1
Use(s)	Hotel	Hotel
Acreage	2.8 acres	2.8 acres
Lots	1	1
Parcels	0	0
Square Footage/GFA	14,612 sq.ft.	15,980 sq.ft.
Dwelling Units:	N/A	N/A

C. History: A special exception, SE-3241, was approved by the District Council on June 10, 1981, for the existing high-rise hotel on the subject property.

D. Master Plan Recommendation: The 1986 adopted sectional map amendment for Suitland-District Heights and Vicinity, Planning Areas 75A and 75B, retained this property in the I-1 Zone.

E. Request: In order to provide additional comfort and convenience for the clientele of the existing hotel, the applicant is proposing a porte-cachere (car port), 23 feet long, 25 feet wide, and 26 feet high, with an accompanying canopy (covered walkway), 61 feet long, 13 feet wide, and 14 feet high. The portion of the parking lot in front of the hotel will be repaved to provide a passenger drop-off area. The proposed porte-cochere and walkway will have a standing seam metal roof. The proposed columns and horizontal bands for the walkway and the porte-cochere will have an EIFS finish. The columns for the porte-cachere will have a brick base to match the brick façade of the existing hotel building. The applicant is also restriping the parking lot to bring the site into conformance with current regulations.

F. Neighborhood and Surrounding Uses:

- North— Auto repair use in the I-1 Zone
- East— Hampton Park Boulevard and a retail center across Hampton Park Boulevard
- South— Motel in the I-1 Zone
- West— Storage place in the I-1 Zone

G. Minor Change Provisions: The proposed revisions are generally subject to Sections 27-325(b) and 27-325(f)(1).

Section 27-325(b) provides that:

- (1) The Planning Board is authorized to approve the following minor changes:
 - (A) An increase of no more than fifteen percent (15%) in the gross floor area of a building;
 - (B) An increase of no more than fifteen percent (15%) in the land area covered by a structure other than a building;
 - (C) The redesign of parking or loading areas; or
 - (D) The redesign of a landscape plan.

The subject property consists of 68,210 square feet of paved area and 14,612 square feet of building area. The applicant is proposing a porte-cochere and canopy covering an area of 1,368 square feet. The proposal will cover two percent of the existing paved area with a canopy and porte-cochere and will increase the existing gross floor area of the building by nine percent. The proposal will not add more than 15 percent of gross floor area and will not cover more than 15 percent of the existing paved area. The proposal includes a minor redesign of the parking area. Therefore, the proposal meets the above criteria for a minor change to the special exception.

H. Specific Special Exception Requirements:

The following Specific Special Exception requirements are applicable to the subject minor change:

Sec. 27-365. Hotel or motel, of the Zoning Ordinance requires the following:

(a) A hotel or motel may be permitted (except those covered under Subsection (b), below), subject to the following:

(2) The proposed use shall have frontage on, and direct vehicular access to, a street with a right-of-way width of at least seventy (70) feet;

Hampton Park Boulevard has an existing right-of-way width of 100 feet.

I. Parking Regulations: Section 27-568 of the Zoning Ordinance requires one space per three seats for a restaurant and one space for two guest rooms for a hotel.

The required parking for the subject hotel are as follows:

Restaurant (44 seats—one space for three seats) = 15 spaces

Hotel (198 guest rooms—one space for two guest rooms) = 99 spaces

Total = 114 parking spaces

Special exception SE-3241 also approved 114 parking spaces for the existing hotel and restaurant. The applicant is proposing 199 spaces by restriping the existing parking lot.

J. Loading Requirements: Section 27-582 requires one loading space for a hotel with an area of 10,000 square feet to 100,000 square feet. The applicant has provided a loading space as required by the Zoning Ordinance.

K. Landscape Manual Requirements: The subject proposal will not increase the existing paved area for parking and will not add more than ten percent of gross floor area to the existing building. Therefore, the proposal is exempt from the requirements of the Landscape Manual. However, the applicant has provided landscaping that meets the requirements of Section 4.3, Parking Requirements, of the Landscape Manual.

L. Zone Standards: The proposal meets all other requirements of the I-1 Zone.

M. Required Findings:

Section 27-317(a) of the Zoning Ordinance provides that a special exception may be approved if:

(1) The proposed use and site plan are in harmony with the purposes of this Subtitle.

The proposed revisions are minor in nature and are intended to increase the comfort and convenience of the patrons of the existing hotel by providing a covered entrance to the hotel from the parking lot. The proposed restriping of the parking lot will provide adequate parking. Therefore, the proposal will not alter the Council's previous finding of conformance with this requirement.

- (2) The proposed use is in conformance with all the applicable requirements and regulations of this Subtitle.

The proposed revision is minor in nature and conforms to all the applicable requirements and regulations of this Subtitle.

- (3) The proposed use will not substantially impair the integrity of any validly approved Master Plan or Functional Master Plan, or in the absence of a Master Plan or Functional Map Plan, the General Plan.

The proposed revision will enhance the existing use of the property as a hotel by providing a covered entrance and adequate parking for the patrons of the hotel . Special exception SE-3241 found that the existing hotel was consistent with the master plan’s guidelines for high landscaping and design standards. The proposed revision will also be consistent with these guidelines for high landscaping and design standards. The proposed revision uses colors and materials that are compatible with the colors and materials of the existing hotel. Therefore, the proposed use will not substantially impair the integrity of the master plan for the subject area.

- (4) The proposed use will not adversely affect the health, safety or welfare of residents or workers in the area.

The proposed revisions will enhance the existing use of the property as a hotel by providing a covered entrance and adequate parking. Therefore, the proposal will not adversely affect the health, safety or welfare of residents or workers in the area.

- (5) The proposed use will not be detrimental to the use or development of adjacent properties or the general neighborhood.

The proposed revisions will enhance the existing use of the property as a hotel by providing a covered entrance and adequate parking. Therefore, the proposal will not be detrimental to the use or development of adjacent properties or the general neighborhood.

- (6) The proposed site plan is in conformance with an approved Tree Conservation Plan.

The proposal is exempt from the requirements of the Tree Conservation Ordinance and does not have an approved Tree Conservation Plan.

N. Referral Comments:

1. In a memorandum dated September 27, 2004, the Permits Review Section has requested minor changes to the site plan. Conditions of approval have been added to require the changes.
2. In a memorandum dated October 11, 2004, the Transportation Planning Section has stated that the site plan is acceptable.

3. In a memorandum dated September 30, 2004, the Environmental Planning Section has stated that there are no environmental impacts due to the proposal.
4. In a memorandum dated October 7, 2004, the Subdivision Section has stated that the site plan matches Plat NLP 110@4, recorded in 1981.
5. In a memorandum dated October 13, 2004, the Community Planning Division has stated that the 1985 approved master plan and 1986 adopted sectional map amendment for Suitland-District Heights and vicinity, Planning Areas 75A and 75 B, retain the property in the I-1 Zone. The master plan recommends high landscaping and design standards for development in this area. The proposal is consistent with the high landscaping and design standards recommended in the master plan.
6. In a memorandum dated October 26, 2004, the Urban Design Section has recommended minor design changes and has stated that the proposal is exempt from the requirements of the Landscape Manual.

CONCLUSION:

The proposal is minor in nature and will not alter the previous findings of special exception SE-3241.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Subtitle 27 of the Prince George's County Code, the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission adopted the findings contained herein and approved ROSP SE-3241/01, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certification of the ROSP SE application, the site plan and sign design drawings shall be revised to show the following:
 - a. A parking schedule that shows the parking requirements for the existing swimming pool.
 - b. A note stating that the play ground is removed.
 - c. A loading schedule.
 - d. The height of all the existing fences.
 - e. Green area calculations and location of the provided green area.
 - f. The right-of-way and centerline of Hampton Park Boulevard.
 - g. All the setbacks for the proposed canopy and porte-cochere.

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

* * * * *

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the action taken by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner Harley, seconded by Commissioner Vaughns, with Commissioners Harley, Vaughns, Eley and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioner Squire absent at its regular meeting held on January 6, 2005, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 27th day of January 2005.

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator