

RESOLUTION

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

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on April 17, 2008, regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-06096 for Marriott Hotels at Bowie—Melford, Lot 1, Block 2, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The subject application is for approval of three hotels on a single lot for a total of 362 rooms within the Melford development (previously known as the Maryland Science and Technology Center). The project proposes three separate buildings: the Marriott Courtyard Hotel, the Residence Inn, and the Springhill Suites.

2. **Development Data Summary**

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone(s)	M-X-T	M-X-T
Use(s)	Vacant	Hotel
Acreage	10.05	10.05
Lots	1	1
Square Footage/GFA	0	253,289

Parking Data

Parking spaces for hotel (one space/two hotel rooms): Courtyard Hotel—137 rooms Residence Inn—125 rooms Springhill Suites—100 rooms Total rooms = 362 rooms	181 spaces
Parking spaces for restaurant seating within the hotels (one space/3 seats): Courtyard Hotel—50 seats Residence Inn—40 seats Springhill Suites—40 seats Total seating = 130	45 spaces
Parking spaces for meeting space (one space/4 seats): Courtyard Hotel—450 Residence Inn —40 Total seating = 490	123 spaces
Total parking spaces required	349 spaces

Parking proposed (Universal sizes [9 feet x 18 feet] per DDS approved by the City of Bowie	362 spaces
--	------------

3. **Location:** The subject property is located northeast of the intersection of Melford Boulevard and Science Drive.
4. **Surroundings and Use:** To the north of the subject property is proposed office space and woodland; to the east and south is a stormwater management pond; to the south is an existing office building and to the west is the interchange of US 301 and Belair Drive/Melford Boulevard.
5. **Previous Approvals:** On January 25, 1982, the District Council approved Zoning Map Amendment Application and Basic Plan No. A-9401 for the subject property (Zoning Ordinance No. 2-1982). This Zoning Map Amendment rezoned the property from the R-A and O-S Zones to the E-I-A Zone. On July 7, 1986, the District Council approved Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-8601, affirming the prior Planning Board decision (PGCPB No. 86-107), for the Maryland Science and Technology Center. The preliminary plan was approved by the Planning Board on September 28, 2000 (Resolution PGCPB 99-28(A)). Specific Design Plan SDP-0103 was approved by the Planning Board on April 26, 2001. A final plat of subdivision was approved on December 24, 2003, for the subject property.

The property was included in the *Approved Master Plan and Vicinity and Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Areas 71A, 71B, 74A, 74B*. The property was rezoned from the E-I-A Zone to the M-X-T Zone through the approval of CR-11-2006 on February 6, 2006. On February 15, 2007, the Planning Board approved the CSP-06002, which proposed a mixed-use development consisting of a hotel, office, retail, restaurant, research and development, residential (366 single-family detached and attached units and 500 multifamily units). On September 11, 2007, the District Council approved Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06002, rejecting the residential component of the proposed development.

6. **Design Features:** The detailed site plan proposes three separate Marriott hotels to be developed on the property. The site is roughly triangular in shape and the three hotels form a courtyard as viewed from the main entrance road into the development, Melford Boulevard.

The Courtyard Hotel is a five-story structure located at the intersection of Melford Boulevard and Science Drive. The front of the building faces Science Drive, which contains the main access point into the property. This building contains both a sit-down restaurant and an indoor pool. The front of the building includes a covered drop-off area. At the rear of the building is an outdoor patio and lounging area for the guests, screened by a six-foot-high metal fencing and EIFS-coated masonry panels with piers in an alternating pattern. The architectural elevations of the building include a beige-colored brick covering the entire first floor of the structure. Alternating brick and EIFS areas cover the second through fifth floors of this building. The architectural detailing of the

building appears to be satisfactory and the standing seam roofing materials proposed provides a high level of quality.

The Residence Inn is a five-story structure located at the intersection of Science Drive and Old Crain Highway. The front of the building faces Melford Boulevard and the rear of the building backs to Old Crain Highway. This structure includes a one-story portion of the building that is designed as a “gatehouse” where visitors will enter into the building. This structure serves as the lobby and clubhouse portion of the hotel and has direct access to the outdoor pool provided for visitors during the summer months. An outdoor sport court is also proposed just off the pool area for additional exercise opportunities.

The Springhill Suites is located at the northernmost end of the site and backs to the woodland preservation area on the site. This five-story structure includes an outdoor patio area and an indoor pool.

A retaining wall is proposed along Old Crain Drive and appears to be located within the PUE. This retaining wall should be relocated and adjusted such that it is clearly outside of the PUE.

The plans have a pedestrian system that links the hotels to one another. The pedestrian system proposes brick pavers and seating elements along a centrally located miniature plaza. The plans also depict a fountain as a focal point in the center of the plaza in front of the Residence Inn. This feature is intended to provide both a visual focal point and a refuge.

Signage information for the property has been submitted but appears to be a generic format for the use by any Marriott Hotel, rather than site-specific details. Therefore, staff recommends that the condition regarding signage review proposed by the City of Bowie be adopted (see Finding 20).

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **The Requirements of the Zoning Ordinance:** The subject application has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements in the M-X-T Zone.

Section 27-548—Section 27-548 includes regulations for the M-X-T Zone. The requirements relevant to the subject project are included in bold faced type below and are followed by staff’s comment:

- (a) **Maximum floor area (FAR):**
 - (1) **Without the use of the optional method of development –0.40 FAR; and**
 - (2) **With the use of the optional method of development —0.80 FAR.**

Comment: Section 27-548(a) limits the development within the M-X-T Zone to a maximum floor area ratio (FAR) of 0.40, unless an applicant proposes use of a specified optional method of

development, which would increase it to a maximum of 8.00. Further, Section 27-548(e) indicates that the floor area ratio shall be applied to the entire property that is the subject of the conceptual site plan. The following chart lists all development within the Melford development for use in calculating floor area ratio:

SDP/DSP	Development Quantity	Status
Pre-1998	240,000 sq. ft.	Built
SDP-0103	153,250 sq. ft.	Built
SDP-0104	300,000 sq. ft.	Approved
SDP-0201	83,680 sq. ft.	Built
SDP-0203/01	81,600 sq. ft.	Approved
SDP-0405	136,957 sq. ft.	Approved
DSP-07072	24,375 sq. ft.	Pending
DSP-06096	362 room hotel 253,289 sq. ft.	This Plan
Total	1,273,151 sq. ft.	

The floor area ratio, including all approved and pending development on the 334.1-acre Melford site and reflected on the chart above, is .0874, well within the M-X-T Zone 0.40 maximum floor area ratio requirement. Future detailed site plans for the Melford development should include an updated FAR development chart and a recalculation as necessary of the floor area ratio to demonstrate conformance to Section 27-548. A condition of approval requiring such information is included in the recommendation section of this report.

- b. **Section 27-546(d) for development in the M-X-T Zone are as follows:**
1. **The proposed development is in conformance with the purposes and other provisions of this division;**

Comment: The proposed hotel complex is in conformance with the concept of mixed-use development located near major transit nodes. This location is ideal for the development of a hotel use because it will service the already existing uses within the development including the existing office uses.

2. **The proposed development has an outward orientation which is either physically and visually integrated with existing adjacent development or catalyzes adjacent community improvement and rejuvenation;**

Comment: The project is designed with an outward orientation toward the MD 3 corridor to the west. The project should be visible from the corridor. The design of the architectural elevations of the Courtyard Hotel will provide a visually integrated appearance with the other existing buildings in the vicinity.

3. **The proposed development is compatible with existing and proposed development in the vicinity;**

Comment: The hotel use will complement the existing uses in the vicinity including the office uses and the existing residential community as well.

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

Comment: The mix of uses as proposed by the subject application and the previously approved applications will provide for the arrangement and design of buildings in order to reflect a cohesive development capable of sustaining an independent environment of quality and stability. The plans propose a tree conservation area that will provide a natural buffer to the north of the subject property. The landscape plans uses native plant materials which will contribute to a sustainable environment.

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

Comment: It is anticipated that the first building to be built is the Courtyard Hotel, which is located in a highly visible portion of the site, at the intersection of Melford Drive and Science Drive. The second building will be the Residence Inn, and the third building will be the Springhill Suites. The applicant has explained that the Marriott Hotels is in the process of revisiting their architecture for the Springhill Suites hotel and that this is anticipated to be in final form some time in 2008.

6. **The pedestrian system is convenient and comprehensively designed to encourage pedestrian activity within the development;**

Comment: The plans have been redesigned since the original submittal to provide for a pedestrian system on the site that provides for the hotel users to easily and comfortably move from one area of the site to another. The plans incorporate pedestrian-friendly measures such as seating

elements, direct routes, primary crosswalks that use a change of paving material or striping, and landscaping to provide a variation of shade and sunny areas.

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

Comment: Again, the areas that have been set aside for the movement of pedestrians have been designed to accommodate them in a safe and comfortable environment; in addition the plans reflect areas for active recreation and activities including swimming and basketball or other court games, sitting and socializing at the poolside or on patios. The use of paving of crosswalks and drop-off areas with brick pavers provides a noticeable change in types and textures of materials and the landscaping is of high-quality native plant species.

8. **Conceptual Site Plan CSP- 06002**

The conceptual site plan was approved by the District Council on September 11, 2007, with the following conditions applicable to the review of the proposed detailed site plan:

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

Staff Comment: The Transportation Planning office provided the following analysis of the development and its conformance to the trip cap above:

SDP	Development Quantity	Status	AM Trip Generation	PM Trip Generation
SDP-0103	153,250 sq. ft.	Built	112	115
SDP-0104	300,000 sq. ft.	Approved	600	555
SDP-0201	83,680 sq. ft.	Built	127	118
SDP-0310	300,980 sq. ft.	Withdrawn	0	0
SDP-0203/01	81,600 sq. ft.	Approved	163	151
SDP-0402	62,440 sq. ft.	Approved	97	89
SDP-0405	234,000 sq. ft.	Approved	300	284
DSP-07072	24,375 sq. ft.	Approved	168	122
DSP-06096	253,289 sq. ft.	This Plan	235	290
Total	1,493,614 sq. ft.		1802	1724

Comment: The chart above demonstrates that the development on the property is below the trip cap as established in the review and approval of CSP-06002. It should be noted that the subject property has a record plat, which is the subject of a trip cap. The record plat, 199@42, for Lots 1, 2, 3 and 4, Block 2, contains the following note:

“Any further development of this property that would generate more than 2,200 AM and 2,605 PM trips will require the submission of a new preliminary plat with a new traffic impact study.”

This trip cap is below the trip cap of the CSP, but is binding on the land area covered by final plats that were the subject of the underlying preliminary plan. Therefore, as a condition of approval of this case, the staff recommends that the trip cap of the preliminary plan, as shown on the final plat of subdivision, should be listed as a condition of approval for this case.

2. **Prior to issuance of any building permits for lots that have not been recorded, the following road improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances, (b) have been permitted for construction through the operating agency’s access permit process, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with the appropriate operating agency.**

- (A) **At the MD 3/MD 450/gas station access intersection:**

The applicant shall provide an additional northbound and southbound

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

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

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

Governors Bridge Road shall be widened, and a left-turn lane shall be added, as recommended by DPW&T. Because of the short right-turn-only lane, the widening shall extend from the intersection of US 301 to the apartment complex driveway, and the entire roadway shall be restriped, to provide two outbound lanes for approximately 250 feet, all as recommended by DPW&T.

Staff Comment: The subject property is Lot 1, Block 2, and is recorded in Plat Book 199 at Plat 42; therefore, this condition does not apply.

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

Staff Comment: This condition requires the CSP to be revised to indicate the information above. The subject detailed site plan is removed from both the Melford Historic Site and the impact review area that includes the house site and the cemetery and establishes the vista between them.

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

Staff Comment: The subject application is not within the immediate vicinity of the Melford Historic Site.

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

Staff Comment: The subject application does not involve the immediate vicinity of the Melford Historic Site, the Duckett Family cemetery, the shared viewshed, or the surrounding impact review area. Therefore, conditions **4, 5, 7, 21** and **22** are not relevant to the subject detailed site plan application, but the applicant should demonstrate compliance with these conditions of

CSP-06002 with subsequent relevant applications.

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

Staff Comment: The applicant has complied with CSP-06002 Conditions 6 and 8 through the submittal of a Historic Area Work Permit (HAWP #45-07) that addresses the exterior rehabilitation of the historic site in anticipation of its use as a single-family dwelling. However, the applicant is required to submit a detailed site plan for any portion of the developing property that includes the Melford Historic Site environmental setting and its associated impact review area.

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

Staff Comment: The subject application does not involve the immediate vicinity of the Melford Historic Site, the Duckett Family cemetery, the shared viewshed, or the surrounding impact review area.

- 8. Prior to issuance of building permits for any property within CSP-06002, the applicant shall initiate the restoration of the Melford House and outbuildings, through the historic area work permit process. The restoration of Melford and outbuildings shall be completed prior to issuance of use and occupancy permits for any future hotel or office uses.**

Staff Comment: The owner of the Melford Historic Property, St. John Properties, is currently proceeding forward with the improvements to the historic site. At the time the District Council approved SP-06002, the Marriott Hotel project was shown on the CSP on Lot 1. Therefore, the hotels were not intended to mean those shown on the plan before the District Council, but were intended to mean hotels in the future.

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

Staff Comment: The applicant is in compliance with the requirement above to submit regular quarterly condition reports for the historic site and is expected to continue to do so until a permanent use for the building is identified.

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

Staff Comment: The applicant has provided revised plans that include an extensive network of internal sidewalks, walkways, and courtyards. Internal pedestrian access has been addressed on the subject site with these connections. Access is provided between the proposed buildings, to Science Drive, and through the parking lots. Old Crain Highway is an existing open section road that leads to the Sherwood Manor community. No sidewalks are recommended along this frontage as Sherwood Manor consists entirely of open section roads. The existing sidewalk is reflected along the site's frontage of Science Drive.

No sidewalk is currently shown along Melford Boulevard. Melford Boulevard connects directly to Belair Drive, which includes an existing sidewalk along the north side. No pedestrian access is provided through the MD 3 and Belair Drive interchange. However, sidewalk connections should be provided to connect the Melford community with Belair Drive and that portion of Bowie. Staff recommends that the applicant provide a standard sidewalk along its entire frontage of Melford Boulevard with a curb cut for a future crosswalk and the continuation of the sidewalk to Belair Drive. This sidewalk will link Bowie with the existing trail around the lower pond and the planned trail network throughout Melford. The proposed location of this sidewalk is marked in red on the attached plan.

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

Staff Comment: The applicant has provided revised plans that include an extensive network of internal sidewalks, walkways, and courtyards. Internal pedestrian access has been addressed on the subject site with these connections. Access is provided between the proposed buildings, to Science Drive, and through the parking lots. The applicant has provided a substantial number of additional pedestrian connections, marked crosswalks, and courtyard areas on the revised plans. No additional recommendations are necessary regarding the internal pedestrian network.

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

Staff Comment: The application reflects the existing sidewalk along Science Drive. The submitted plans also reflect a marked crosswalk and pedestrian refuge for the crossing of Science Drive at Science Circle. This crossing will provide access to the trail around the lower pond, as reflected on the submitted plans.

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

Staff Comment: The CSP is pending certification; however, the proposed limits of disturbance shown on the revised TCPII are in general conformance with the TCPI approved by the Planning Board. The TCPII proposes a small area of additional grading to allow drainage of runoff from the site.

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

- i. Revise the plans to address all other staff comments of record; and**
- j. Have the revised plans signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared them.**

Staff Comment: The applicable conditions have only been addressed for this lot within the Melford site but not on the entire TCPII, because the sheets for those other areas were not submitted. Although the DSP only covers a limited area of the site, the TCPII must cover the entire area of the TCPI associated with CSP-06002, and it must meet those conditions prior to certification of this DSP.

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

Staff Comment: Some of the northern portion of the site is within the 150-foot floodplain buffer; however, it is not shown on the plan. Based on the known location of the buffer, there will be no disturbance within that buffer for the proposed development. The TCPII must correctly show the 150-foot floodplain buffer.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certification of the DSP, the TCPII shall be revised to correctly show the 150-foot, 100-year floodplain buffer.

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

Staff Comment: There are no disturbances to the floodplain buffer associated with this application.

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

Staff Comment: This condition does not apply to the subject property because it is not the area referenced in the condition above.

- 18. Prior to approval of any DSP, the applicant shall dedicate to the M-NCPPC 108±, acres including but not limited to 100-year floodplain and floodplain buffer, as shown on the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Exhibit “A”.**

Staff Comment: The applicant has not conveyed the 100-year floodplain and floodplain buffer to M-NCPPC. Department of Parks and Recreation staff recommend conveyance of the parkland prior to certificate approval of DSP-06096 or DSP-07031.

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

Staff comment: This condition should be carried over to the approval of the subject DSP.

- 20. Prior to the approval of a preliminary plan or detailed site plan, the applicant shall demonstrate:**

- a. Development plans shall show minimization of impervious surfaces, through all phases of the project. Structured parking should be used to the maximum extent possible.**

Staff Comment: The submitted TCPII and DSP propose surface parking throughout the site within this application. No structured parking is shown on the plans. The design as shown on the TCPII, DSP, and landscape plans does not allow for the micromanagement of stormwater through natural infiltration. The construction of the parking spaces above the maximum requirement should be designed with permeable paving or other applicable design method that will allow natural infiltration on the site. The number of required spaces is 349 and the number of proposed spaces is 362, leaving only 13 spaces required to be permeable paving. (For more discussion on this issue, see Finding 21.)

Recommended Condition: Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, the DSP and TCPII shall demonstrate the use of alternative parking methods and paving materials to reduce the area of impervious surfaces and promote natural infiltration. This shall be applied to all parking spaces above the maximum requirement.

- b. Streams shall have a 100-foot natural buffer and a 150 foot-wide building and parking setback. There shall be a 150-foot buffer on the 100-year floodplain. If a utility must be extended into any buffer, then an equal area of natural buffer alternative shall be retained on community property.**

Staff Comment: There are no disturbances to the stream or floodplain buffers associated with this application.

At the Planning Board hearing, the applicant argued against this condition, claiming that the overall site was 47 percent pervious. The Planning Board agreed with the applicant that a large percentage of the site was pervious.

- c. **Clearing for utility installation shall be minimized, especially in environmentally sensitive areas, and clearing for utilities in those areas shall be coordinated, to minimize ground or buffer disturbance. Woodland disturbed for that purpose shall be reforested, in cooperation with the appropriate utility.**

Staff Comment: All of the proposed clearing is located in the central and southern half of the site. This clearing is consistent with the TCPI approved with the CSP; however, the proposed water, sewer, and stormdrain connections are not shown on the plan. It does not appear that any utility connection will affect the proposed woodland conservation areas, with the exception of the required ten-foot public utility easement. This information should be shown on the plan to be reviewed with the proposed woodland conservation for conformance with the approved stormwater management plan.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, the TCPII and DSP shall be revised to show all water, sewer and stormdrain connections and their associated easements. The plan shall also show the ten-foot public utility easement. No woodland conservation be should be shown in any easements.

- d. **The open space system, including but not limited to environmentally sensitive areas, shall extend through the site and shall link the different uses. Portions of the open space system shall be visible to and accessible from public streets.**

Staff Comment: The condition above includes some open space which contains existing natural features including wetland and woodland. This area should be considered part of the open space network for the overall site.

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

Staff Comment: The subject site is not within the vicinity of the historic site; therefore, this condition does not apply.

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

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

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

Staff Comment: The subject site is not within the vicinity of the historic site; therefore, this condition does not apply.

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

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

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

- f. Screen parking from the streets, and ensure that attractive buildings and signage are visible from the streets.**
- g. Minimize the expanse of parking lots through the use of shared parking, structured parking or decks, or landscape islands.**
- h. Provide a hierarchy of pedestrian-scaled, high-quality, energy-efficient direct and indirect lighting that illuminates walkways, ensures safety, highlights buildings and landmark elements, and provides sight lines to other retail uses.**
- i. Create a signage package for high-quality signs and sign standards, with requirements for all retail and office tenants and owners. The standards shall address size, location, square footage, materials, logos, colors, and lighting. Any revision to existing approved signage plans shall incorporate the previously approved designs.**
- j. Eliminate all temporary signage on the site or attached to the exterior facades of a building.**
- k. Make retail pad sites compatible with the main retail/office/hotel component. If the retail pad sites are located along the street, parking shall be located to the rear of the pad sites.**
- l. Provide green areas or public plazas between pad sites.**
- m. Ensure that restaurants have attractive outdoor seating areas, with views of public spaces, lakes, or other natural features.**

Staff Comment: The subject application for a hotel use is actually a residential/lodging use and does not fall under the category of the retail uses in the commercial zones. Therefore, the condition above does not apply to the subject property. However, the plans have been designed to conform to the intent of the conditions above.

- 24. Detailed site plans for new research and development "flex space" shall not exceed 10 percent of total space (excluding existing research and development) within the M-X-T Zone. Generally this flex space is intended as an interim use, which shall be redeveloped predominantly with office use, as market conditions permit. When an area is initially developed as research/development, flex space or warehouses, that area should be the first considered for redevelopment, when market conditions permit new office development. The applicant shall demonstrate that its long-term goal is to have all flex space uses converted to commercial office, with supporting retail (including a main street) and hotel uses, within a reasonable time period.**

Staff Comment: The subject application is not subject to the condition.

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

Comment: There are no stream channels on this portion of the site that have not been shown.

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

- a. Plans shall show the stormwater management ponds as amenities, with gentle natural slopes and extensive native planting.**

Staff Comment: There is one stormwater management pond located on the site at the intersection of Melford Boulevard and Science Drive. This area is relatively small and will most likely not be visible from the passersby. Landscaping of the area is not proposed on the plans. The landscape plan should be revised prior to signature approval to reflect an abundant amount of the landscaping with native plant material.

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

Staff Comment: This condition does not apply because the subject site is not within close proximity of the historic site.

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

Staff Comment: The plans do not appear to reflect this requirement, so a condition has been included on the plans requiring a revision to reflect the requirement.

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

Staff Comment: This condition does not apply to the subject site because it does not have frontage on US 50.

28. Recreation Facilities Conditions:

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

Staff Comment: This condition appears to be a carryover from the original CSP that included a residential component. That plan was approved with a condition to remove the residential component from the plans; however, it appears that the condition relating to the development of residential units still remains on the plans.

The subject application proposes two outdoor pools in association with two of the hotels on the site and a third indoor pool is proposed for the third hotel.

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

Staff Comment: This condition does not apply, because the project is the subject of a final plat of subdivision.

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

Staff Comment: Currently there are no roads extending to the future parkland. The applicant is planning to submit a preliminary plan of subdivision for the eastern portion of the property which will provide public access to the parkland. Since the applicant is required to dedicate 108± acres to M-NCPPC prior to approval of any DSP, the public access to the parkland will not be available at this time. However, DPR staff recommends that temporary public access should be provided from the public street to the parkland at the location agreeable to DPR and applicant.

- e. The applicant shall submit three original, executed Recreational Facilities Agreements (RFA) for trail and trailhead construction to the DPR for their**

approval, three weeks prior to a submission of a final plat of subdivision. Upon approval by the DPR, the RFA shall be recorded among the land records of Prince George's County, Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

- f. The applicant shall submit to the DPR a performance bond, letter of credit or other suitable financial guarantee, in an amount to be determined by the DPR, within at least two weeks prior to applying for building permits.**

Staff Comment: This condition appears to be a carryover from the original CSP that included a residential component. These conditions do not apply to the subject project.

9. **Final Plat of Subdivision:** The final plat of subdivision has a number of notes that reference the previous E-I-A Zone; however, those notes no longer apply since the property has been rezoned to the M-X-T Zone. The trip cap does still apply and has been included as a condition of approval of the subject plan.
10. **Landscape Manual:** The plans are subject to Sections 4.2, 4.3(a) and 4.3(c) of the *Landscape Manual*. The plans have attempted to demonstrate conformance, however, the plans should be revised to incorporate the proper schedules of the Landscape Manual in order to prepare the plans for permit review. Therefore the staff has included a condition of approval that requires the plans to be revised prior to certificate of approval.
11. **Woodland Conservation Ordinance:** The site has a natural resources inventory that is currently under review with a preliminary plan of subdivision. Currently, the TCPII shows woodland that appears to be associated with a forest stand delineation (FSD) other than what was submitted with Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06002 because the tree line is different. The acreage of the existing woodland on the net tract is also different. The information on the approved TCPI must be used for the TCPII worksheet unless conditions on the site have changed. Show the existing tree line in accordance with the approved TCPI associated with CSP-06002, or a forest stand delineation for the subject site.

The worksheet indicates that there is 0.50 acre of 100-year floodplain on the site; however, no floodplain exists on this lot. The 150-foot floodplain buffer does exist on the site. Revise the plan to eliminate the floodplain-related acreages from the worksheet for this phase of development.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, the TCPII shall be revised to reflect the correct woodland acreage in accordance with the signed TCPI associated with CSP-06002, or a revised forest stand delineation shall be submitted that clarifies the acreages.

Recommended Condition: The TCPII shall be revised to eliminate the floodplain-related acreages from the worksheet for this phase of development, or a 100-year floodplain study shall be submitted that clarifies the acreages.

This property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because it has previously approved tree conservation plans. The most recently approved plan, TCPI/44/98-02, was in conjunction with CSP-06002. The CSP is pending certification and the TCPI is pending signature approval. The TCPII submitted with this application must be in conformance with the CSP conditions of approval and the associated TCPI prior to certification.

The proposed clearing has slightly increased from what was approved on the TCPI. The additional clearing is for a stormdrain inlet that is necessary to convey water from the site. The only significant change is that the plan now proposes afforestation to meet some of the requirement on-site. The TCPII cannot be fully reviewed because the acreages on the worksheet are incorrect. As discussed in the previous section, floodplain acreages must be removed from the worksheet.

The TCPII only covers one lot of the entire Melford site (CSP-06002), and it is at a larger scale than the original TCPII. The plan must be revised to cover the entire area of the approved TCPI prior to certification of this DSP and a phased worksheet must be used. The plan must be submitted at a scale of 1 inch equals 50 feet. The revision box must be completed to reflect changes to this TCPII and reference the subject application. Revise the TCP signature block to reflect all previous approvals in typeface. Eliminate the proposed tree line from the plan. Show the symbol for the proposed tree signage on the plan and in the legend.

The detail for the woodland conservation signage is incorrect. Eliminate all woodland conservation from the water, sewer, stormdrain, and ten-foot public utility easements. Eliminate the slopes symbol from the plan. The legend identifies a preservation area as "tree conservation area." This should be revised to say "woodland preservation area." Specify in the legend the type of woodland conservation for each symbol (i.e., woodland preservation, woodland afforestation).

Recommended Condition: Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, the TCPII shall be revised as follows:

- a. Submit a TCPII that covers the entire site of the approved TCPI and show a phased worksheet on the cover of the plan.
- b. Revise the plan so that it is at a scale of 1 inch = 50 feet.
- c. Revise the TCPII so that it is in conformance with the TCPI associated with CSP-06002.
- d. Submit a 1 lot revision worksheet for the site.
- e. Eliminate all woodland conservation from the water, sewer, stormdrain, and ten-foot public utility easements.

- f. Show the correct sign detail with posts.
 - g. Update the revision box to reflect changes to this TCPII and reference the subject application.
 - h. Revise the TCP signature block to reflect all previous approvals in typeface.
 - i. Eliminate the proposed tree line from the plan.
 - j. In the legend revise “tree conservation area” to “woodland preservation area.”
 - k. Specify in the legend the type of woodland conservation for each symbol (i.e., woodland preservation, woodland afforestation).
 - l. Show the required reforestation notes and edge management notes.
 - m. Revise the worksheet as necessary.
 - n. After all these revisions have been made, have the qualified professional who prepared the plan sign and date it.
12. **Subdivision:** Melford has two approved Preliminary Plans of Subdivision, 4-98076 (approved 08/28/00) and 4-02093 (approved 02/06/03). The former preliminary plan (which includes this property) was for the majority of what was then called the Maryland Science and Technology Center to the west, while the latter was for three parcels to the east and was limited to two stormwater management ponds. An amended Basic Plan (A-9401/02) for the site was approved as part of the master plan and sectional map amendment for Bowie and vicinity (CR-11-2006, adopted 02/07/06). The amended basic plan reflected development of the types being presented in this application.

The subject DSP shows a general layout consistent with the approved preliminary plan of subdivision and record plat (Plat Book 199-42, University of Maryland Science and Tech Center).

13. **Historic Preservation:** The historic preservation office reviewed the plans for compliance with the CSP-06002 and provided the following comments:

The larger Melford property (but not the specific property that is the subject of DSP-06069) includes the Melford Historic Site (71B-016). Built in the 1840s, Melford is a 2½-story brick plantation house of side-hall-and-double-parlor plan. The house is distinguished by a two-story, semicircular bay and a parapetted, double chimney at the south gable end. Attached to the north gable end is a lower kitchen wing built of brick and stone. The interior exhibits fine Greek Revival-style trim. The house was built by Richard Duckett and later was home to three generations of the Hardisty family. The grounds include several early outbuildings and terraced

gardens, and there is a Duckett family burial ground on the adjoining knoll to the northwest. The bay and chimney configuration makes Melford unique in Prince George's County. The property is also listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

In conformance with the conditions of the District Council's approval of CSP-06002, the applicant must:

- a. Delineate and note both the environmental setting and the impact review area for the Melford Historic Site on the subject plan and all subsequent plans (Condition 3).
- b. Comply with Conditions 4, 5 and 7 in order to retain the historic vista from the Melford House to the cemetery and develop new construction plans for the impact review area that enhance the historic vista.
- c. Comply with Condition 6 and submit a plan and timetable for the protection, stabilization, restoration and planned adaptive use for the Melford Historic Site through the historic area work permit process. The plan, timetable and HAWP are to be reviewed by the Historic Preservation Commission.
- d. Comply with Condition 8, prior to the issuance of building permits, by initiating the restoration of the historic site through the historic area work permit process.
- e. Comply with Condition 9 by regularly submitting the required quarterly conditions reports for the historic site and ensuring that the historic site is properly maintained.
- f. Comply with Conditions 21 and 22 by conducting Phase II archeological research within the property parcel associated with Melford House and in the vicinity of the family cemetery.

Comment: None of the conditions above applies to the subject site.

14. **Archeology:** In a memorandum dated October 9, 2007, the staff archeologist stated that a Phase I archeological survey would not be recommended on the subject site because a search of current and historic photographs, topographic and historic maps, and locations of currently known archeological sites indicates the probability of archeological sites within the subject property is low. Moreover, they pointed out that the extensive grading which had occurred on the property would have most likely adversely impacted any intact archeological deposits. As a caveat, however, they stated that Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act might require federal agencies take the effects of their undertakings on historical properties, including archeological sites, into account, when state or federal monies are expended or federal permits required for a project.

The archeological interests of the Melford site include the following as stated in memo dated February 13, 2008:

A Phase I archeological survey was conducted on the property in February 2005. Three archeological sites were identified on the property. Site 18PR30 is a Late Archaic through Woodland period short-term base camp located adjacent to the Patuxent River floodplain. The portion of the site within the subject property had been extensively disturbed by tree removal and grading. Therefore, the site did not retain its integrity and no further work was recommended.

Site 18PR164 consists of archeological deposits and features associated with the Melford Historic Site (#71B-016). Artifacts recovered date to from the late 18th century to the present. Four cultural features and a sheet midden were identified around the house. Some of the artifacts may reflect the activities of African-American slaves. Phase II investigations were recommended for site 18PR164 to assess its eligibility for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places.

Site 18PR165 is the Duckett family cemetery, located about 650 feet northwest of Melford. Development plans placed a buffer area around the cemetery. Several shovel test pits were excavated outside of and around the cemetery to determine if there were additional unmarked burials. No evidence of unmarked burials was found, but staff recommends that a ground penetrating radar survey of the vicinity of the cemetery be completed as part of additional required archeological investigation of the property within the limits of this preliminary plan.

Both archeological site 18PR164 and archeological site 8PR165 are located within the Melford Historic Site environmental setting (#71B-016).

Staff concurs with the report's findings that no further work is necessary on site 18PR30. Staff also concurs that Phase II investigations are necessary on sites 18PR164 and 18PR165. A Phase II work plan was submitted to Historic Preservation staff on January 14, 2008, and was approved on January 18, 2008. The applicant must submit the findings of the Phase II investigations in the form of a draft report to be reviewed by staff before a final report for the work can be accepted in compliance with Conditions 21 and 22 of CSP-06002.

15. **Community Planning:** In a memorandum dated November 5, 2007, the Community Planning North Division stated that the application is not inconsistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies for the Developing Tier and conforms to the 2006 Bowie and vicinity master plan's recommendation for mixed-use development. They also pointed out, however, that the application does not meet certain guidelines of the master plan. More specifically:

The following guidelines excerpted from the 2006 approved Bowie and vicinity master plan apply to this application:

Pages 12, 13 and 16

“a....This area should be developed with a moderate- to high-density mixture of office, employment, retail, hotel, residential and parkland/open space uses. This will offer a mix of

employment and residential uses that can create a place of activity and interaction for those who live, work, or visit in the area....”

“(4) The community shall be focused upon an open space network consisting of the Melford house and its historic vista, and other public spaces, which are surrounded by a combination of commercial, civic, cultural or recreational facilities. This network shall be designed with adequate amenities to function as a fully shared space for the entire community.”

“(5) The community shall contain additional linked open space in the form of squares, greens, parks, and trails that are accessible, safe and comfortable. The open space should provide a variety of visual and physical experiences. Some of these open spaces should be bordered by buildings and be visible from streets and buildings.”

“(6) ...All uses are connected by sidewalks; crosswalks run through and across the parking lots and drive aisles to connect all buildings and uses; sidewalks are wide, appealing, shaded and configured for safe and comfortable travel; pedestrian walkways are separated from vehicular circulation by planting beds, raised planters, seating walls, on-street parallel parking and/or structures; walking distances through parking lots are minimized and located to form logical and safe pedestrian crossings, and walkways are made more pedestrian-friendly through the use of arcades, canopies, street trees, benches, and tables and chairs;...”

“(29) The open space system, including but not limited to environmentally sensitive areas, shall extend through the site and link the uses. Portions of the open space system shall be visible to and accessible from public streets.”

Staff Comment: This application has been revised since the original review comments by the Community Planning Division. The plans have been revised to provide elements such as the miniature plaza located central to the site, the fountain design, and the attention to detail demonstrated in the landscape design that will create a sense of place among the three proposed hotels and the entire Melford development. Pedestrian linkages have been established internally between the hotels and perimeter sidewalks have been included to connect to the other sections of the Melford development.

16. **Transportation:** The transportation staff has reviewed issues regarding the development of the subject site and the larger Maryland Science and Technology Center (total of 466 acres) in conjunction with A-9401, CDP-8601, and Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-88030. Since those plans were approved, there has been considerable development within the Maryland Science and Technology Center. The preliminary plan and CDP approvals established a square footage cap for the initial phase of 1.95 million square feet. Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-98076 affirmed a trip cap of 2,200 AM and 2,605 PM peak-hour vehicle trips for all remaining development on the site.

The subject application is for the construction of three hotels with a total gross floor area of 253,289 square feet. The three buildings would generate approximately 235 and 290 AM and PM

peak-hour trips, respectively. With the subject application and the previous approvals, the site would generate 1,824 AM and 1,747 PM peak-hour trips. These projected trips remain within the cap established by CDP-8601/Preliminary Plat 4-88030.

At a public hearing on January 11, 2007, the Planning Board approved CSP-06002, which included the subject property. The CSP was approved with a new trip cap of 2,774 AM or 3,593 PM peak-hour vehicle trips. With the approval of the subject application, neither trip cap will be exceeded. Regarding on-site circulation, staff finds the proposed DSP to be acceptable.

17. **Department of Parks and Recreation:** In a memorandum dated February 1, 2008, the Department of Parks and Recreation offered the following comment regarding the subject application's conformance to the following enumerated parks-related conditions of CSP-06002, District Council Resolution SP-06002.

Condition 18: Prior to the approval of any DSP, the applicant shall dedicate to M-NCPPC approximately 108 acres including but not limited to the 100-year floodplain and the floodplain buffer, as shown on the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Exhibit "A."

Condition 19: Land to be conveyed is subject to the following Conditions 1–9 in Exhibit "B."

1. **An original, special warranty deed for the property to be conveyed (signed by the WSSC Assessment Supervisor), shall be submitted to the Subdivision Section of the Development Review Division, M-NCPPC, along with the Final Plat.**
2. **The M-NCPPC shall be held harmless for the cost of public improvements associated with land to be conveyed, including but not limited to, sewer extensions, adjacent road improvements, drains, sidewalks, curbs and gutters, and front-foot benefit charges prior to and subsequent to Final Plat.**
3. **The boundaries and acreage of land to be conveyed to the M-NCPPC shall be indicated on all development plans and permits, which include such property.**
4. **The land to be conveyed shall not be disturbed or filled in any way without the prior written consent of the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR). If the land is to be disturbed, the DPR shall require that a performance bond be posted to warrant restoration, repair or improvements made necessary or required by The M-NCPPC development approval process. The bond or other suitable financial guarantee (suitability to be judged by the General Counsel's Office, the M-NCPPC) shall be submitted to the DPR within two weeks prior to applying for grading permits.**
5. **Storm drain outfalls shall be designed to avoid adverse impacts on land to be conveyed to or owned by The M-NCPPC). If the outfalls require drainage improvements on adjacent land to be conveyed to or owned by The M-NCPPC, the**

DPR shall review and approve the location and design of these facilities. The DPR may require a performance bond and easement prior to issuance of grading permits.

- 6. All waste matter of any kind shall be removed from the property to be conveyed. All wells shall be filled and underground structures shall be removed. The DPR shall inspect the site and verify that land is in acceptable condition for conveyance, prior to dedication.**
- 7. All existing structures shall be removed from the property to be conveyed, unless the applicant obtains the written consent of the DPR.**
- 8. The applicant shall terminate any leasehold interests on property to be conveyed to the Commission.**
- 9. No stormwater management facilities, or tree conservation or utility easements shall be proposed on land owned by or to be conveyed to The M-NCPPC.**

Department of Parks and Recreation Comment: The applicant had not conveyed the 100-year floodplain and floodplain buffer to M-NCPPC. DPR staff recommends conveyance of the parkland prior to signature approval of the first of the following detailed site plans: DSP-07072, DSP-06096 or DSP-07031.

Urban Design Comment: A recommended condition below would require such conveyance.

Condition 29: d. If necessary, a public access easement shall be recorded from US 301 to the proposed public parkland over the planned private streets to provide public access to the park.

Department of Parks and Recreation Comment: There are no roads currently extending to the future parkland. The applicant is planning to submit a preliminary plan of subdivision for the eastern portion of the property which will provide public access to the parkland. Since the applicant is required to dedicate approximately 108 acres to M-NCPPC prior to approval of any detailed site plan, the public access to the parkland cannot be planned at this time. However, the Department of Parks and Recreation staff recommends that temporary public access should be provided from the public street to the parkland at a location mutually agreed on by the Department of Parks and Recreation and the applicant.

In addition, the Department of Parks and Recreation recommended additional conditions regarding the property to be conveyed as part of this application that have been included in the recommendation section of this report.

Permits: In a memorandum dated October 12, 2007, the Permit Review Section offered

numerous comments that have either been addressed by revisions to the plans or in the recommended conditions below.

18. **Environmental Planning:** The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed the detailed site plan submitted for Melford, Marriott Hotels at Bowie, DSP-06096, and the Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/36/99-06, stamped as received on January 22, 2008. The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of Detailed Site Plan DSP-06096 and revised Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/36/99-06.

The Environmental Planning Section previously reviewed the area in this application in conjunction with the following applications: Specific Design Plans SDP-0201, SDP-0203, and SDP-0203/01; Basic Plan A-9401; Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-08601; Preliminary Plans of Subdivision 4-02093 and 4-98076; Type I Tree Conservation Plan TCPI/44/98; and Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/36/99. All of these plans were approved. Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06002 was approved by the Planning Board on January 11, 2007. The District Council approved this plan on September 11, 2007. The CSP and revised TCPI have not yet been certified.

Site Description

The 10.50-acre property identified as Lot 1, Block 2, is part of the 431.55-acre Melford (Maryland Science and Technology Center) site that is zoned M-X-T. Lot 1 of Block 2 is located in the northwest quadrant of Science Drive and Melford Boulevard. The larger Melford site is located in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of US 50 and US 301/MD 3. A review of the available information indicates that streams, wetlands, 100-year floodplain, and severe slopes are found to occur on this property. The predominant soils found to occur, according to the Prince George's County Soil Survey, include Adelphia, Collington, Mixed alluvial land, Ochlocknee and Shrewsbury. The Mixed alluvial land and the Adelphia soils have limitations with respect to high water tables and impeded drainage. The other soil series pose few difficulties to development. According to available information, Marlboro clay is not found to occur in the vicinity of this property. US 50 (John Hanson Highway) and MD 301 are existing freeways and traffic-generated noise impacts are anticipated. Based on information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Wildlife and Heritage Program, there are no rare, threatened, or endangered species found to occur in the vicinity of this property; however, there are records of "species of concern" known to occur within the vicinity of the site. There are no designated scenic and historic roads in the vicinity of this property. According to the adopted Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan, all three network features (regulated areas, evaluation areas and network gaps) are present on the site. This property drains to an unnamed tributary located in the Patuxent River basin, is located directly adjacent to the Patuxent River, and is located in the Developing Tier in the adopted General Plan.

A copy of the stormwater management concept plan approval letter and plan were not included in the submittal of the DSP. Concept approval is required prior to certification of the DSP.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, submit copies of the approved stormwater management concept plan and letter. The concept must be correctly reflected on the TCPII.

19. **Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T):** In a memorandum dated February 5, 2008, DPW&T stated that because the project is located within the incorporated limits of the City of Bowie, it would not impact any county-maintained roadways and the stormwater management concept plan for the project would be approved by the City of Bowie.

20. **City of Bowie:** In a letter dated January 24, 2008, the City of Bowie offered the following:

“On January 22, 2008, the Bowie City Council conducted a public hearing on the above-referenced matter. The applicant in this case, Columbia Properties, is proposing to construct three (3) five-story hotel buildings on Block 2, Lot 1, for a total of 253,289 sq. ft. The site is comprised of 10.05 acres within the larger 466-acre Melford development and is governed by the recently approved Conceptual Site Plan (CSP-06002) for the Melford development. The subject property is zoned M-X-T (Mixed-Use Transportation Oriented), which does not require a specific number of parking spaces for the site, and the applicant has provided 362 parking spaces for 362 hotel rooms.”

“At the conclusion of hearing, the City Council voted unanimously to recommend **APPROVAL** of DSP #06096 with the following conditions and one (1) consideration, which are intended to maintain the consistency of features for this project with existing and approved projects in the Melford development, to comply with adopted City policy, and to improve the quality and aesthetics of the subject development:

 - “1. A note shall be placed on the plans that all decorative banners and signs shall be prohibited from the site other than one (1) standard size American flag.
 - “2. The applicant shall redesign the dumpster enclosures such that they are uniform and match the courtyard wall enclosure behind the Courtyard Hotel. The corners of the dumpsters shall have columns with end caps matching those in the courtyard area.
 - “3. The applicant shall submit a separate detailed site plan for signage for the hotel site or revise the site plan to include signage specifications such that the square footage of all of the signage and the height of the monument sign is consistent with other approved signage and monument signs in the Melford development.
 - “4. The applicant shall include a Tracking Table on the plans that shows how much hotel square footage has been permitted and how much has been approved for the entire Melford development and how much is proposed for this site.

“In addition to the above conditions, City Council recommends one Consideration as

follows:

“Consideration #1: The applicant shall consider applying Green Building techniques to the site, including such features as a green roof.”

21. In the approval of the SDP-0203/01, as stated in PGCPB No. 04-209(A) the following condition of approval was imposed on the plan:

The applicant shall recapture the unused potential square footage set forth in CDP-8601 for Parcels 2B and 2C (without structured parking) by agreeing to develop the adjacent Parcel 2A to include 100 percent of the maximum allowable square footage designated in CDP-8601 for Parcel 2A for a total of 208,074 square feet. The applicant shall further be required to file a specific design plan application for Parcel 2A with the M-NCPPC staff prior to receiving any Use and Occupancy permits for the structures on Parcels 2B and 2C.

Parcel 2A, referenced in the condition above, is in fact the same property that is under review in the subject DSP-06069. The condition above places a restriction on a parcel of land that was not under consideration by the Planning Board at the time, by requiring accommodation of 208,074 square feet of commercial space on Parcel 2A.

It is clear that the rezoning of the property from the E-I-A zone to the M-X-T Zone nullified the previous condition of the SDP-0203/01. That being said, the current proposal for the development of the Marriott at Bowie proposes a total of 253,289 square feet of hotels regardless of the enforceability of the previous SDP condition, the subject detailed site plan before the Planning Board, DSP-06069, fulfills the intent of the previous condition, and exceeds the minimum square footage prescribed for the subject parcel by SDP-0203/01.

22. The Sherwood Manor Civic Association has submitted a letter into the record stating the following concerns and recommendation, date February 11, 2008:

“The Sherwood Manor Civic Association (SMCA) recommends approval of this DSP for three hotels with conference and restaurant amenities and with an entrance and two exits on Science Drive. However, we are concerned that the project may require a dedicated left turn lane on Science Drive to improve traffic flow and so as not to interfere with left-turning traffic on Old Crain Drive. We also recommend that to compensate for the excess parking provided, 10 percent of the provided parking be built in permeable materials, to improve compliance with Condition 20(a) of the Conceptual Site Plan (CSP)-06002 on minimization of impervious surfaces, and to increase water infiltration on the eastern side of the site in accordance with the Maryland Stormwater Management Act of 2007.”

“The applicant met with representatives of the SMCA on four occasions – before Bowie’s stakeholder meeting, at the stakeholder meeting, and twice since. The applicant’s willingness to meet and discuss his plans and to seek common ground with the neighboring community is unprecedented among the Maryland Science and Technology Center (MSTC)/Melford applicants and is greatly appreciated.”

“Findings

- “1. **We believe that these three classy hotels and their conference facilities will be a huge draw to future businesses thinking about locating at MSTC/Melford.** Not only will the hotels accommodate people for long-term stays, they will have a relatively large conference room, a bar and restaurants that can be used by others at the MSTC site. These uses comply with the 2006 Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan, CSP-06002, and Bowie’s covenants.

- “2. **The proposed main entrance on Science Drive may require creation of a dedicated left-turn lane, to reduce conflicts between left-turning traffic for the hotels and for Old Crain Drive by Sherwood Manor residents and to ensure free flow of traffic to other businesses further along Science Drive.** At present, Science Drive is two lanes in each direction, with parking permitted on the curb lane. A traffic circle is planned for the intersection of Melford Blvd and Science Drive in early 2008. All traffic will arrive at the three hotels via a single entrance on Science Drive, creating a backup of left-turning traffic that might easily extend back to the traffic circle. The left turn into the hotel parking lot from Science Drive is only a few yards short of the left turn onto Old Crain Drive, a small, curvy 2-lane road that is the sole access road for Sherwood Manor, a residential neighborhood. The hotel traffic would also create congestion for other offices on Science Drive. Unless an additional, dedicated left-turn lane is created, there would be only a single lane to go around the left-turning traffic. Currently, cars are allowed to park along the curb.

- “3. **Condition 20a of the Conceptual Site Plan (CSP-06002) states that: “Development plans shall show minimization of impervious surfaces, through all phases of the project”.** In addition, the recently approved Maryland Stormwater Management Act of 2007 highlights a new approach that minimizes impervious surface to provide opportunities for water to infiltrate directly into the soil, reducing the inflow into stormwater management ponds (see Attachment 1).

- “**The applicant has requested 362 parking spaces – 182 for the hotels, 45 for the restaurants, and 123 for the meeting spaces—compared with his own calculation of a minimum required of 350 for the multiple uses.** The applicant does not offer a reason for the excess number of spaces, although we have been told that the Marriott corporation franchise requires one space per hotel room. The impervious surface implied by the 362 spaces has been reduced by 10 percent (from 65,341sf to 58,644sf) by using universal (162sf) instead of standard sized (180.5sf) parking spaces. However, this is still 12 spaces in excess of the applicant’s own assessment of the minimum required (350). Further, for the M-X-T zone, the 350 minimum can be adjusted downward based on estimates of peak time demand, the timing of uses, and joint uses. For example, it is likely that fewer than

350 spaces will be used most of the time, given that hotel spaces are often used at night, while conference spaces during the day. The ‘restaurants’ are small and intended mainly for the hotel residents, requiring no additional parking spaces.”

“We recommend that the proposed 362 parking spaces be approved, provided that 10 percent (36) are provided in permeable materials. This would reduce impervious surfaces by another 10 percent without affecting the number of spaces that the applicant needs to satisfy the requirements of his franchise. It would satisfy condition 20a of CSP-06002 and help achieve greater infiltration and water quality on the eastern part of the site, reducing runoff into the lower pond. It would provide additional credits for LEED certification, which we support for all buildings at this environmentally sensitive site. To be effective, the pervious parking spaces should be located in areas with low traffic, far from the hotel entrances, as ‘overflow’ parking. A brochure by the state of Massachusetts on the benefits and types of permeable parking surfaces is provided in Attachment 2.”

“Recommendation

“We recommend that the Planning Board approve DSP-06096 with the following conditions of approval:

- “(1) 10 percent of the 362 parking spaces will be provided in permeable materials, to be located on areas with low traffic as ‘overflow’ parking.
- “(2) A additional dedicated left-turn lane will be created to accommodate the left-turning traffic into the hotel entrance on Science Drive.”

Staff Comment: The staff has spoken to the applicant regarding the community’s request and the applicant objects to both recommendations by the citizen association. The applicant is concerned about maintenance of permeable pavement. They also believe that an additional left-turn lane is not appropriate at this time and should be determined by the City of Bowie after the development is constructed. The Transportation Planning Office gave the following opinion of the recommendation:

“Regarding on-site circulation, staff finds the proposed DSP to be acceptable. However, with respect to access to the site, the Sherwood Manor Civic Association raised a concern regarding the need for a left-turn lane for vehicles entering the site from northbound Science Drive. Specifically, the letter cited the possibility of conflicts between left-turning vehicles into the site and vehicles oriented toward the Sherwood Manor community. Staff agrees that a dedicated left-turn lane for the hotel traffic along Science Drive would enhance traffic operation. Staff also recognizes the fact that, in order for this left-turn lane to function effectively, there needs to be a parking prohibition along Science Drive between Melford Boulevard and Old Crain Drive. Because all of these public streets fall within the operational purview of the City of Bowie and not the Department of Public and Transportation (DPW&T), the parking prohibition must be

enforced by the City of Bowie.”

The recommendations of the Sherwood Manor Civic Association have not been incorporated into the staff recommendation, but see Condition 5 for a similar condition regarding pervious pavement.

23. The applicant submitted revised architectural elevations for all three of the buildings including the Courtyard Marriott, the Residence Inn Marriot and the Spring Hill Suites, after the originally scheduled public hearing. The plans were reviewed by the staff, a meeting was scheduled and negotiations to improve the architectural proposals occurred and the plans were revised, generally in accordance with the requests made by staff. The changes made to the architecture include the following:
 - a. The Courtyard Marriott was revised to add brick to the rear elevations which will be visible upon entry into the Melford development and the pattern of brick to EIFS is consistently applied to the elevation.
 - b. The Residence Inn was revised to incorporate a color palette similar to the Courtyard Marriot, and the roof of the gate house and the roof over the rear entrance into the Residence Inn were upgraded from an asphalt shingle to a standing seam roof. Additional brick finish was added to the highly visible end walls of the building, near the main entrance into the site. The rear elevations were also enhanced with additional brick finish.
 - c. The Spring Hill Suites architecture is a new product that is being introduced by Marriot for 2008. It is a modern building design with a flat roof. The exterior elevation is treated as a combination of brick and EIFS. The building is predominantly EIFS and could be improved with additional brick treatment on the end walls wrapping the brick to the front elevation, which will be visible from Melford Boulevard (and possibly US 301) and from Old Crain Drive. Staff recommended that each endwall “cap” be finished in brick. The Planning Board added a requirement to integrate the proposed signage into the building.
24. As required by Section 27-285(b) of the Zoning Ordinance, the detailed site plan represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines of Subtitle 27, Part 3, Division 9 of the Prince George’s County Code without requiring unreasonable cost and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Subtitle 27 of the Prince George's County Code, the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission adopted the findings contained herein and APPROVED the Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII/36/99-06) and further APPROVED Detailed Site Plan DSP-06069 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. If any development of the subject property combined with that of all other properties approved under Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-98076 would cumulatively generate

more than 2,200 AM and 2,605 PM trips, a new preliminary plan with a new traffic impact study shall be required prior to approval of the DSP.

2. In conformance with the *Approved Master Plan for Bowie and Vicinity and Sectional Map Amendment* and CR-11-2006, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide a standard sidewalk along the subject site's frontage of Melford Boulevard from the vicinity of the storage shed at Springhill Suites to Science Drive, unless modified by the State Highway Administration.
3. Prior to certification of the DSP, the TCPII shall be revised to correctly show the 150-foot, 100-year floodplain buffer.
4. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, the TCPII and DSP shall be revised to show the all water, sewer and stormdrain connections and their associated easements. The plan shall also show the ten-foot public utility easement. No woodland conservation be should be shown in any easements.
5. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, the TCPII shall be revised to reflect the correct woodland acreage in accordance with the signed TCPI associated with CSP-06002, or a revised forest stand delineation shall be submitted that clarifies the acreages.
6. The TCPII shall be revised to eliminate the floodplain-related acreages from the worksheet for this phase of development, or a 100-year floodplain study shall be submitted that clarifies the acreages.
7. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, the TCPII shall be revised as follows:
 - a. Submit a TCPII that covers the entire site of the approved TCPI and show a phased worksheet on the cover of the plan.
 - b. Revise the plan so that it is at a scale of 1 inch = 50 feet.
 - c. Revise the TCPII so that it is in conformance with the TCPI associated with CSP-06002.
 - d. Submit a single lot revision worksheet for the site.
 - e. Eliminate all woodland conservation from the water, sewer, stormdrain, and ten-foot public utility easements.
 - f. Show the correct sign detail with posts.
 - g. Update the revision box to reflect changes to this TCPII and reference the subject application.

- h. Revise the TCP signature block to reflect all previous approvals in typeface.
 - i. Eliminate the proposed tree line from the plan.
 - j. In the legend revise “tree conservation area” to “woodland preservation area.”
 - k. Specify in the legend the type of woodland conservation for each symbol (i.e., woodland preservation, woodland afforestation).
 - l. Show the required reforestation notes and edge management notes.
 - m. Revise the worksheet as necessary.
 - n. After all these revisions have been made, have the qualified professional who prepared the plan sign and date it.
8. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, the applicant shall submit copies of the approved stormwater management concept plan and letter. The concept must be correctly reflected on the TCPII.
9. A note shall be placed on the plans that all decorative banners and signs shall be prohibited from the site other than jurisdictional flags.
10. Prior to signature approval of the plans:
 - a. The applicant shall redesign the dumpster enclosures such that they are uniform and match the courtyard wall enclosure behind the Courtyard Hotel. The corners of the dumpsters shall have columns with end caps matching those in the courtyard area.
 - b. The landscape schedules shall be added to the plans to demonstrate conformance to the *Landscape Manual*.
 - c. The retaining wall proposed along Old Crain Drive located within the Public Utility Easement (PUE) shall be relocated and adjusted such that it is clearly outside of the PUE.
 - d. The architectural elevations for the Spring Hill Suites shall be revised to add brick as an exterior finish to the endwall and wrap the brick to the nearest front façade projection, and revise the signage to reflect better integration into the building façade.
11. The square footage of all of the signage and the height of the monument sign shall be consistent with other approved signage and monument signs in the Melford development.

12. The applicant shall include a tracking table on the plans that shows how much square footage has been approved for the entire Melford development and how much is proposed for the subject site, and calculate the floor area ratio proposed.
13. As requested by the City of Bowie, the applicant should consider applying green building techniques to the site, including such features as a green roof.

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

* * * * *

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the action taken by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner Squire, seconded by Commissioner Clark, with Commissioners Squire, Clark, Vaughns and Parker voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioner Cavitt absent at its regular meeting held on Thursday, April 17, 2008, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 8th day of May 2008.

Oscar S. Rodriguez
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

OSR:FJG:SL:bjs