



Note: Staff reports can be accessed at www.mncppc.org/pgco/planning/plan.htm.

Detailed Site Plan

DSP-06018

Application	General Data
<p>Project Name: TownePlace Suites by Marriott</p> <p>Location: West side of Baltimore Avenue (US 1), 900 feet south of its intersection with Cherry Hill Road.</p> <p>Applicant/Address: Baywood Hotels Belle Point Office Park 7681 Belle Point Drive Greenbelt, MD 20770</p>	Date Accepted: 11/9/06
	Planning Board Action Limit: Waived
	Plan Acreage: 1.29
	Zone: M-U-I, C-S-C, DDOZ
	Dwelling Units: N/A
	Gross Floor Area: 46,229 sq. ft.
	Planning Area: 66
	Tier: Developed
	Council District: 1
	Municipality: College Park
	200-Scale Base Map: 212NE04

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates
Construction of a 75-room hotel and rezoning of 0.9 acre from the C-S-C Zone to the M-U-I Zone.	Informational Mailing: 6/16/06
	Acceptance Mailing: N/A
	Sign Posting Deadline: 8/05/08

Staff Recommendation		Staff Reviewer: H. Zhang, AICP	
APPROVAL	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS	DISAPPROVAL	DISCUSSION
	X		

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL
PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Detailed Site Plan, DSP-06018, TownePlace Suites by Marriott
Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/176/06

The Urban Design staff has completed review of the subject application and appropriate referrals. The following evaluation and findings lead to a recommendation of APPROVAL with conditions, as described in the recommendation section of this report.

EVALUATION

The detailed site plan was reviewed and evaluated for compliance with the following criteria:

- a. The requirements of the 2002 *Approved College Park US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* and the standards of the Development District Overlay Zone (DDOZ);
- b. The requirements of the Zoning Ordinance in the DDOZ and M-U-I Zones;
- c. The requirements of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-05012;
- d. The requirements of the *Landscape Manual*;
- e. The requirements of the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance;
- f. Referrals.

FINDINGS

Based upon evaluation and analysis of the subject application, the Urban Design staff recommends the following findings:

1. **Request:** The subject application is for approval of a 75-room hotel by Marriott. The applicant is also requesting a change in the underlying zone for the portion of the site (approximately 0.9 acre) in the C-S-C (Commercial Shopping Center) Zone to the M-U-I (Mixed Use-Infill) Zone.

2. **Development Data Summary:**

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone(s)	M-U-I/C-S-C/DDOZ	M-U-I/DDOZ
Use(s)	Residential	Hotel
Acreage	1.29	1.29
Parcels	1	1
Square Footage/GFA	1,509	46,229
Number of Hotel Rooms	-	75

OTHER DEVELOPMENT DATA

Parking Requirements Per Section 27-568(a)

Uses	Parking Spaces
Hotel (75 rooms at one space per 2 rooms)	38

The minimum number of off-street parking spaces permitted for each land use type shall be reduced by 10 percent from the required spaces of Section 27-568(a) pursuant to Site Design S2. Parking Area, Standard T. of the 2002 *Approved College Park US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment*

34

Parking Provided*	75 spaces
Of which Structure parking spaces	54 spaces
Surface parking spaces	21 spaces

Handicapped spaces required 2 spaces

Handicapped spaces provided	2 spaces
Of which Van accessible space	1 space
Standard space	1 space

Note: *The plan provides a total of 75 parking spaces at a rate of one space per room, which are 41 spaces more than the maximum required; thus the plan does not comply with the parking requirements. The applicant has requested an amendment to this requirement. See Finding 7 below for discussion.

Loading spaces

Required per Section 27-582

1

Hotel or motel

1 space/10,000 to 100,000 GFA

Provided

1

3. **Location:** The site is located on the west side of Baltimore Avenue (US 1), across the street from the intersection of Baltimore Avenue and Hollywood Road within the City of College Park, in Planning Area 66 and Council District 1. The site is also located in Area 5 (Autoville Drive Residential Area), Subarea 5b, and Area 6 (North Gateway Mixed Commercial Area), Subarea 6a, of the Approved 2002 College Park US 1 Corridor Sector Plan where detailed site plan review is required for conformance with the Development District Overlay Zone (DDOZ) standards.
4. **Surrounding Uses:** The site is bounded on the east side by Baltimore Avenue (US 1); on the west side by Autoville Drive; on the south by Park Drive (a private drive); and on the north by two developed properties in the C-O (Commercial Office) and M-U-I (Mixed Use-Infill) Zones. The property is split zoned with a C-S-C zoned portion fronting Baltimore Avenue and a M-U-I zoned portion separated from Baltimore Avenue by the C-S-C portion.
5. **Previous Approvals:** The entire site was formerly split-zoned in the C-S-C (Commercial Shopping Center) and R-55 Zones and was improved with a single-family detached house. The 2002 *Approved College Park US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment*, which was approved by the District Council on April 30, 2002 (CR-18-2002), rezoned the portion of the site not fronting on Baltimore Avenue from the R-55 Zone to the M-U-I Zone and retained the portion of the site fronting Baltimore Avenue in the C-S-C Zone. On September 8, 2005, the Planning Board approved (PGCPB Resolution No. 05-190) Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-05012 for this site with 13 conditions. Subsequently, the Planning Board approved a one-year extension of the preliminary plan of subdivision and the approval remains valid through October 6, 2008 or until a final plat is approved prior to the expiration date. The site also has an approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan No. 31315-2002-01, which will be valid through September 16, 2008.
6. **Design Features:** The subject site is a roughly rectangular property with one end fronting Baltimore Avenue and the other end fronting Autoville Drive. There is a portion of wetland located close to Autoville Drive. The proposed hotel building has a T-shaped footprint with the top of the “T” oriented toward Baltimore Avenue. Twenty-one surface parking spaces are located to the north of the building near the entrance to the site from Baltimore Avenue. The rest of the parking spaces are located in the lower levels of the building. The surface parking spaces, if viewed from Baltimore Avenue, are located to the right side of the building.

The elevation of the proposed hotel building that fronts on Baltimore Avenue shows a four-story, hipped-roof building with cross-gables. The elevation is vertically divided by using sections with different projections and finishing materials that combine bricks of different tones, fiber cement panels and standard siding. The two elevations that are perpendicular to Baltimore Avenue feature similar roof patterns and combinations of finishing materials. Due to topographical

changes, these two elevations present a five- to six-story appearance with a parking garage at the bottom of the building. A uniform fenestration pattern is applied on the three elevations. The elevation that fronts on Autoville Drive shows a more solid composition with significantly fewer window openings, but it has a similar combination of finishing materials and roof patterns. The elevation design in general is acceptable. However, the application of the finishing materials seems random, especially on the elevation that fronts on Baltimore Avenue. A condition has been proposed in the recommendation section of this report to require the applicant to be more consistent in the use of finishing materials on the elevations.

Two building mounted primary identification signs have been proposed with this DSP. The maximum allowable sign face area for the building mounted sign, according to Section 27-613(c) of the Zoning Ordinance, is calculated based on the total linear feet of building frontage and the number of stories of each building up to 400 square feet of signage per building. The DDOZ standards call for an equivalent or smaller sign face area than the square footage per Section 27-613(c). The proposed sign package shows a total of 130.54 square feet of sign face area for the two building-mounted signs, which is well below the allowable square footage for this type of sign.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

- 7. The 2002 Approved College Park US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment and the Standards of the Development District Overlay Zone (DDOZ):** The 2002 College Park US 1 Corridor Plan defines long-range land use and development policies, detailed zoning changes, design standards and a DDOZ for the US 1 Corridor area. The land use concept of the sector plan divides the corridor into six areas for the purpose of examining issues and opportunities and formulating recommendations. Each area has been further divided into subareas for the purpose of defining the desired land use types, mixes, and development character. The subject site is in Area 5 (Autoville Drive Residential Area), Subarea 5b, and Area 6 (Central Gateway Mixed-use Area), Subarea 6a, on the west side of US 1. The vision for Area 5 is for residential uses only. The land use recommendation for Subarea 5b, east of Autoville Drive and west of Baltimore Avenue is for a comprehensively planned residential neighborhood with a mix of single-family attached and multifamily housing types, including limited retail along Cherry Hill Road, and an opportunity to use traditional neighborhood design techniques. A small area of 5b exists as a narrow strip along the east side of Autoville Drive North. The vision for Area 6 is to create a mixed-commercial area with a variety of retail, hotel and office uses in mid-rise buildings and a new grade-separated interchange. Buildings may be sited further from the street and from each other than in the town center and main street areas. Parking should be located in lots sited to the side or rear of properties. Shared parking is strongly encouraged. Sidewalks set back from the curb edge with trees and landscaping on both sides will create the gateway boulevard envisioned for US 1. The specific subarea land use recommendation for Subarea 6b on the west side of US 1 is for infill commercial development, if feasible after the intersection and road improvements are completed. Adequate buffers should be provided and building heights should step down to be compatible with the adjacent existing residential neighborhood.

The application as proposed in the subject detailed site plan including the use (as a hotel), site layout, and the building height is in general compliance with the land use vision and recommendation for Subarea 6a. However, since the rear portion of the site is located in Subarea 5b, which is envisioned for a mix of residential housing types, the hotel use is not consistent with the residential land use pattern.

Section 27-548.25(b) of the Zoning Ordinance requires that the Planning Board find that the site plan meets applicable development district standards. The development district standards are organized into three categories: public areas, site design, and building design. The applicant has submitted a statement of justification that provides a detailed explanation of how the proposed hotel project conforms to each development district standard and why the amendments are required.

- a. The detailed site plan meets most of the standards with the exception of several development district standards for which the applicant has requested an amendment. In order to allow the plan to deviate from the development district standards, the Planning Board must find that the alternative development district standards will benefit the development and the development district and will not substantially impair implementation of the sector plan. The amendments that the applicant has requested are discussed below.

PUBLIC AREAS:

P6. Utilities

- A. All new development within the development district shall place utility lines underground. Utilities shall include, but are not limited to, electric, natural gas, fiber optics, cable television, telephone, water and sewer.**

Comment: The applicant has requested an amendment to modify this standard. The applicant states that there are three utility poles carrying overhead lines located along the US 1 frontage of the subject property; but they are within the future right-of-way of US 1. The three utility poles are to be retained. The applicant does not propose to underground the overhead utilities and believes that utility undergrounding should be part of the future upgrade of US 1, not part of this project. The applicant also indicates that, in accordance with feedback from Potomac Electric Power Company (PEPCO), the utility company that has jurisdiction over the area, a partial undergrounding of utilities for this site only may cause technical issues for their power grid. The Planning Board, the City of College Park and the District Council have all acknowledged the need for a systematic approach for undergrounding utilities and the need for each project to provide its financial fair share in order to implement this measure. The DDOZ standard calls for reducing the visual impact of existing overhead utility lines and associated poles along Baltimore Avenue within the development district by consolidating utility pole usage, relocating utility poles, or placing existing utility lines underground. The applicant will place new utility lines that serve the proposed development such as natural gas, fiber optic, cable television, telephone, and water and sewer service underground. According to the applicant, the above standard has been met since the applicant is not providing any additional utility poles and the visual impact of the utility lines will be improved by the provision of attractive architecture, street trees, street lighting, and furniture. Staff agrees that undergrounding of utilities should be carried out systematically in order to reduce cost and minimize interruption of established operations and services. Staff has disclosed the new requirements to the applicant, and the applicant is fully aware of this approach and is willing to provide a pro rata share of the total expense should the undergrounding of utilities happen in a systematic way in the future. However, in accordance with the Council's recent approval of other cases within this Corridor, a certain portion of the fee should be paid prior to issuance of a building permit. The applicant is obligated to

provide a pro rata share of the cost for a systematic undergrounding of all utilities within the US 1 Corridor in the future. A condition has been proposed in the recommendation section of this report to require the applicant to contribute \$5,000 to a fund prior to issuance of any building permits.

SITE DESIGN

S2. Parking Areas

S. The maximum number of off-street surface parking spaces permitted for each land use type shall be equal to the minimum number of required off-street parking spaces in accordance with Section 27-568(a) of the Zoning Ordinance.

Comment: The applicant has requested an amendment to this maximum off-street parking requirement because the DSP provides almost twice the number of parking spaces as the maximum allowed by the sector plan. The DSP is for a 75-room hotel by Marriott. According to Section 27-568(a) of the Zoning Ordinance, the required number of parking spaces for this DSP is 38, which is calculated based on one space for every two rooms. The DSP provides 75 parking spaces of which 54 parking spaces (about 72 percent) are provided within the parking garage that occupies the first two floors of the hotel building, and 21 parking spaces are provided at ground level as surface spaces. This parking arrangement will give the proposed development the appearance of complying with DDOZ Standard S2. The parking garage will not substantially increase the height of the building. The maximum allowed building height in Subareas 5b and 6a is five stories. Due to the topographical changes of the site, the proposed building is five stories viewed from Baltimore Avenue, which complies with the maximum height limit.

The proposed surface parking has been designed to be consistent with the applicable surface parking standards of DDOZ Standard S2. The 21 surface parking spaces are located to the north of the hotel building and will be adequately screened by the proposed landscaping from the views from Baltimore Avenue. However, since it will take time for the proposed landscaping to be established, staff recommends two low brick walls between 36 and 42 inches in height to be placed on both sides of the driveway entrance to further screen the parked vehicles from views from Baltimore Avenue. The brick walls should match the brick used on the main façade. A condition has been proposed in the recommendation section of this report to require the applicant provide a brick wall and detail on the site plan prior to certification.

Although the sector plan emphasizes the reduction of automobile dependency, the applicant has attempted to comply as much as possible with the design standards, while at the same time adhering to the Marriott Hotel franchise requirements that require one parking space for each guest room. Since the subject site is located very close to the intersection of I-95 and Baltimore Avenue, the applicant expects that most of the guests will be driving to the hotel from outside of the State of Maryland. Further, in order to address any concerns regarding the impact that the additional parking may have, the applicant intends to provide a hotel shuttle service for its guests to certain events at the University of Maryland, which will significantly decrease the number of trips to and from the site. The idea is that once guests arrive for a particular event at the University, there will not be any need for them to take their car off the premises to attend the event. Since the majority of the off-street parking will be located within the underground parking

garage and shuttle service will be provided for hotel guests, staff agrees that the amendment will not substantially impair the sector plan, but will benefit this development given that the site is located so close to the Beltway.

S3. Building Siting and Setbacks

C. A front build-to line between 10-20 feet from the ultimate right-of-way shall be established for all buildings in areas 4, 5, and 6. See Type II Street Edge.

Comment: The applicant has requested an amendment to this standard to allow a small southern portion of the building that fronts on Baltimore Avenue to be sited four feet further away from the US 1 right-of-way than is permitted by the maximum allowed build-to-line. The proposed building façade fronting Baltimore Avenue measures approximately 95 feet long. Approximately 86 feet of this façade is less than 16 feet behind the ultimate right-of-way of US 1. Due to the shape of the property (which has the narrowest side fronting Baltimore Avenue) and the design of the façade (which has a series of recesses away from the front elevation plate), it is difficult to rotate the building to bring the southeast corner into compliance with S3.C without a significant design alteration. Various projections and recesses on the façade fronting Baltimore Avenue provide visual interest to both pedestrians and vehicular traffic. The four additional feet of building setback on a small portion of the façade will not be noticeable and will not substantially impair implementation of the sector plan.

- b. The applicant does not request an amendment to the following standard. However, staff believes that the standard warrants discussion:

PUBLIC AREAS:

P1. Road Network

A. Development should, where possible, provide for on-street parking.

Comment: Baltimore Avenue (US 1) is a principal arterial, undivided five-lane section highway. According to the most recent statistics provided by the State Highway Administration (SHA), the annual average daily traffic (AADT) volume at this location is approximately 52,975 vehicle trips per day. On-street parking is regulated by the State Highway Administration (SHA) for US 1. All parking provided for this development will be within the parking garage. The Urban Design Section believes that the proposed off-street parking is the best alternative for this site.

- 8. **Zoning Ordinance:** The DSP application has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements of the Development District Overlay Zone (DDOZ) for rezoning part of the property from the C-S-C Zone to the M-U-I Zone, and the requirements of the M-U-I Zone of the Zoning Ordinance, as follows:

- a. This DSP application includes a request to change the underlying zone for a section of the property from the C-S-C Zone to the M-U-I Zone, in accordance with Section 27-548.26(b) of the Zoning Ordinance. The area of the property zoned C-S-C fronting Baltimore Avenue is approximately 0.9 acre in size and lies in front of the M-U-I-zoned portion of the development that fronts onto Autoville Drive. The owner of the property may request changes to the underlying zone in conjunction with the review of a detailed

site plan. Pursuant to Section 27-548.26(b)(3) of the Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Board is required to hold a public hearing on the application and make a recommendation to the District Council. Only the District Council may approve a request to change the underlying zone of a property. The applicant is also required to meet the requirements of Section 27-546.16 of the Zoning Ordinance for the Mixed Use-Infill Zone (M-U-I).

Under Section 27-548.26(b)(5) of the Zoning Ordinance, the District Council is required to find that the proposed development conforms to the purposes and recommendations for the Development District as stated in the master plan, master plan amendment or sector plan, and meets applicable site plan requirements. The development generally conforms to the applicable site plan requirements. As mentioned in Finding 7 above, the applicant has applied for several amendments to the development district standards. The sector plan does not contain a purpose section, but identifies four primary goals under sector plan summary (p.159) to be implemented through the development district standards:

First, to create an attractive and vibrant gateway corridor leading to The University of Maryland and the City of College Park.

Second, to promote quality development by transforming US 1 into a gateway boulevard, main street, and town center in a pedestrian and bicycle-friendly environment.

Third, to provide a diverse mix of land uses in compact and vertical mixed-use development forms in appropriate locations along the corridor.

Fourth, to encourage multifamily development to reduce the use of the automobile and also to expand the opportunity for living, working and studying within the corridor.

The area and subarea recommendations (pages 42–43) of the sector plan provide land use and urban design guidelines that establish the preferred mix, type and form of development desired in the six areas and their subareas. For Subareas 5b and 6a (pages 161–162), the sector plan envisions the following:

The vision for Subarea 5b is for a comprehensively planned residential neighborhood with a mix of single-family attached and multifamily housing types, including limited retail along Cherry Hill Road, and an opportunity to use traditional neighborhood design techniques.

The vision for Subarea 6a is for infill commercial development which complements the College Park Marketplace Shopping Center, the IHOP restaurant, Hampton Inn, and other office uses.

The proposed development is a 75-room hotel. The entire site is in a roughly rectangular shape. The site is split zoned into the C-S-C and M-U-I Zones. The larger portion of the site fronting Baltimore Avenue is in the C-S-C Zone and the smaller portion of the site fronting Autoville Drive is in the M-U-I Zone. An area of wetland encumbers part of the site and occupies most of the smaller M-U-I Zone, rendering it impossible to be developed. The proposed hotel is located entirely on the C-S-C Zone. The hotel is also a permitted use in the C-S-C Zone. If the zoning designation were not changed, the applicant could still develop this site as a hotel and meet all C-S-C regulations. The sector

plan rezoned the smaller part of the property from the R-55 Zone to the M-U-I Zone and retained the larger portion in the C-S-C Zone due to a lack of development initiatives at the time of the sector plan. Therefore, to rezone the C-S-C zoned property into the M-U-I Zone so that the entire property is in the same zoning designation would not substantially impair the sector plan.

The Community Planning Division in a memorandum dated November 20, 2007 (Williams to Zhang), noted that the proposed use on the subject site as a hotel conforms to the land use recommendation of Subarea 6a of the sector plan. The smaller part of the site is in Subarea 5b of the sector plan. The community planner stated that although the proposed use does not conform to the recommendation of this subarea, a hotel use is not incompatible with residential development if care is taken to mitigate its impacts during design and development. In fact, as discussed previously, the proposed hotel is contained in one building footprint and is located entirely on the C-S-C zoned portion of the site that fronts on Baltimore Avenue. The entire M-U-I zoned portion is the wetland that will be left undeveloped. The distance between the proposed building and the right-of-way of Autoville Drive is more than 150 feet. Immediately across Autoville Drive from the subject site is a church in the M-U-I Zone. There are no residential uses immediately adjacent to the subject site.

Under Section 27-546.16(b)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance, the owner is required to meet all requirements in the section and show that the proposed rezoning and development will be compatible with existing or approved future development on adjacent properties. In addition, pursuant to Section 27-546.16(c) of the Zoning Ordinance, the M-U-I Zone may be approved only on property which adjoins existing developed properties for 20 percent or more of its boundaries, adjoins property in the M-U-I Zone, or is recommended for Mixed Use-Infill development in an approved master plan, sector plan, or other applicable plan. Adjoining development may be residential, commercial, industrial, or institutional but must have a density of at least 3.5 units per acre for residential or a floor/area ratio of at least 0.15 for nonresidential development.

The applicant has provided a justification statement that outlines how the proposed development plan meets the above requirements. In general, the goals and recommendations of the sector plan have been met by providing a compact hotel development on a site that has previously been developed. The proposed hotel will have its main elevation fronting Baltimore Avenue in accordance with the sector plan's frontage improvement requirements. The building will be sited close to the street with a main entrance directly accessed from Baltimore Avenue. Since a wetland is located in the rear portion of the site, that portion of the site will remain undeveloped and will provide a natural buffer between the proposed development and the property across Autoville Drive, which has an ultimate right-of-way width of 60 feet. Adequate landscape buffers that are in conformance with the requirements of the *Landscape Manual* have been provided between the development and the existing neighborhoods.

In conclusion, staff supports the rezoning of the property from the C-S-C Zone to the M-U-I Zone because the property adjoins existing developed properties for 20 percent or more of its boundaries, adjoins property in the M-U-I Zone, is recommended for mixed-use infill development in the approved College Park US 1 Corridor Sector Plan, and adjoining development consists of residential and commercial uses that have a density of at least 3.5 units per acre for residential and a floor/area ratio of at least 0.15 for nonresidential development. Staff further finds that the proposed development conforms

to the purposes and recommendations for the development district, as stated in the sector plan, and meets applicable site plan requirements.

- b. The general purpose of the M-U-I Zone is to permit, where recommended in applicable plans (in this case the *2002 Approved College Park US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment*), a mix of residential and commercial uses as infill development in areas that are already substantially developed. In addition to site plan requirements for mixed use projects, Section 27-546.18 of the Zoning Ordinance also has specific requirements for hotel use as follows:

- (a) **Except as provided in Subsection (b), the regulations governing location, setbacks, size, height, lot size, density, and other dimensional requirements in the M-U-I Zone are as follows:**

- (3) **C-S-C Zone regulations apply to hotels and motels and all other uses;**

Comment: The C-S-C Zone regulations as presented in Section 27-462 of the Zoning Ordinance prescribe the minimum setbacks for buildings from the street, side and rear lot lines. Since the DDOZ build-to-line standard supersedes the front yard setback, only the side and rear yard setbacks are applicable to this DSP. The DSP meets all applicable setbacks except for the side yard setback from the northwestern boundary line.

- c. According to the Zoning Ordinance, Section 27-462 for the C-S-C Zone, a minimum of 12 feet is required for this side yard setback. If the building is thirty or more feet high, an additional setback equal to one third of the total building height is required. The proposed building is 55.5 feet in height. A total setback of 30.5 feet from the northwestern boundary line is required. The DSP shows a five-foot setback and the applicant has requested a 25.5 foot variance from the required side yard setback requirements.

Section 27-548.25(e) of the Zoning Ordinance provides that if a use would normally require a variance or departure, separate application shall not be required, but the Planning Board shall find in its approval of the site plan that the variance or departure conforms to all applicable development district standards. In the justification statement, the applicant notes that the site is not wide enough to provide the required setback. The proposed building has approximately a 160-foot-long elevation fronting this boundary line. About one-fourth of the elevation and the lower level garage have a minimum five-foot setback from the property line and about 120 feet of the building façade has a 25-foot setback. Given that a large portion of the site along Autoville Drive is unbuildable because of the presence of wetland, the subject site has a limited building envelope. The strict application of the C-S-C setback regulations will make the project impossible to construct. In addition, the boundary line in question is not directly abutting the adjacent property. Instead, there is a private driveway within a 20-foot right-of-way (ROW) between the subject site and the adjoining property. If the width of the ROW were included in the setback calculation, the majority of the building elevation would be 40.5 feet from the property to the northwest of the subject site. The variance from the minimum side yard setback, as included in this DSP, meets the intent of the sector plan for this area and the applicable DDOZ standards in general for the Central Gateway Mixed-use Area. The Urban Design Section recommends approval of this variance application.

9. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-05012:** The Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-05012 with 13 conditions. The following conditions are applicable to the review of this DSP.

2. **Development of this subdivision shall be in compliance with an approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/65/04). The following note shall be placed on the Final Plat of Subdivision:**

Development is subject to restrictions shown on the approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/65/04), or as modified by the Type II Tree Conservation Plan, and precludes any disturbance or installation of any structure within specific areas. Failure to comply will mean a violation of an approved Tree Conservation Plan and will make the owner subject to mitigation under the Woodland Conservation/Tree Preservation Policy.

6. **A Type II tree conservation plan shall be approved in conjunction with the required detailed site plan.**

Comment: A Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/176/06, has been prepared based on the previously approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/65/04, and has been submitted with this DSP. The Environmental Planning Section (Shoulars to Zhang, October 17, 2007) has recommended approval of TCPII/176/06, which will be approved in conjunction with the subject DSP.

8. **The total development within the subject property shall be limited to construction of a 75-room business hotel, or different uses generating no more than 44 AM and 47 PM peak-hour trips, respectively.**

Comment: This DSP proposes to develop the subject site for a 75-room business hotel by Marriott and conforms to this condition.

9. **The applicant shall demonstrate dedication of at least 55 feet from the existing centerline along US 1 and 30 feet from existing centerline along Autoville Drive.**

Comment: This DSP complies with this condition by demonstrating on the site plan that 55 feet from the existing centerline along US 1 and 30 feet from the existing centerline along Autoville Drive have been dedicated.

12. **The applicant shall submit a revised traffic impact study at the time of detailed site plan or provide the city with a letter from M-NCPPC indicating the signalized intersections to be included in the traffic impact study based on segmentation of the corridor, in accordance with the US 1 Corridor Sector Plan.**

Comment: According to a review by the Transportation Planning Section (Mokhtari to Zhang, February 16, 2007), the subject DSP fulfilled this condition because the prepared traffic impact study demonstrated that the expected average Level of Service (LOS) during the AM and PM peak periods for all signalized intersections along the required segment of US 1, between the Capital Beltway and University Boulevard (MD 193) under existing background and total traffic would be at or better than the required LOS E.

13. **The applicant shall address the following at the time of detailed site plan:**
- a. **Design the Baltimore Avenue driveway as a “pork chop” configuration that precludes left turns out of the site, unless a median has been constructed on US 1 in front of the site entrance.**
 - b. **The hotel façade on Baltimore Avenue shall occupy a minimum of 50 percent of the street frontage in accordance with the US 1 Sector Plan Development District Standards.**
 - c. **Include a pedestrian entrance to the hotel from Baltimore Avenue.**
 - d. **The hotel design shall be of high quality and constructed with a minimum of 75 percent brick on the exterior.**

Comment: The DSP complies with the above conditions. The hotel façade on Baltimore Avenue occupies approximately 60 percent of the street frontage. A pedestrian entrance to the hotel from Baltimore Avenue has been shown on the site plan. A total of 75.18 percent of the exterior of the proposed hotel is finished with brick.

- e. **The site plan shall provide for access to a proposed future Hollywood Road, via a proposed future easement through the property at 9604 Baltimore Avenue.**

Comment: A future connection to Park Drive (a private drive with a 20-foot ROW) to the northwestern of the site from the lower level of the parking garage has been discussed. This arrangement will provide the subject site with the access to the proposed future Hollywood Road. However, the DSP does not show the connection. A condition has been proposed in the recommendation section to require the applicant to provide the discussed connection prior to certification of this DSP.

10. **Landscape Manual:** The 2002 *Approved College Park US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* and the standards of the Development District Overlay Zone (DDOZ) have modified Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, of the *Landscape Manual*. In this case, the site plan is subject to Section 4.2, Commercial and Industrial Landscaped Strip Requirements, Section 4.3, Parking Lot Requirements, and Section 4.4, Screening Requirements of the *Landscape Manual*.

- a. The subject site is bounded on the east and west sides by public rights-of-way and on the south by a private gravel road. The landscape plan provides a 10-foot-wide landscape strip along Baltimore Avenue in accordance with Section 4.2 requirements except that the planting units are located within only five feet of the landscaped strip. Since the DDOZ build-to-line standards supersede Section 4.2 at this location, the proposed landscape treatment in general is acceptable. However, the current design shows only one planter in addition to the planting within the site’s frontage; it looks sporadic and lacks unity. Additional planters should be provided to strengthen the landscape pattern in front of the hotel. A condition has been proposed in the recommendation section of this report to require the applicant to add additional planters to the extent practical to beautify the hotel frontage.

- b. Section 4.3(b) requires a perimeter landscaped strip to be provided between a parking lot and an adjacent property. The subject site has the surface parking lot located to the north of the building. On the adjacent site, there is an existing building in the C-S-C Zone. The landscape plan provides a five-foot-wide landscaped strip with one tree and three shrubs for each 35 linear feet of parking lot in accordance with Section 4.3(b).

Section 4.3(c), Interior Planting, requires a certain percentage of the parking lot, according to the size of the lot, to be interior planting area and to be planted with one shade tree for each 300 square feet of interior landscaped area provided. The DSP has approximately 9,649 square feet of surface parking lot for 20 spaces. The remaining parking will be provided in the parking garage within the lower section of the hotel building. A minimum five percent of the parking lot, approximately 483 square feet, should be interior planting area. The applicant provides 1,464 square feet of interior landscaped area which complies with Section 4.3(c) of the *Landscape Manual*.

- c. Section 4.4 requires that all dumpsters and loading spaces be screened from all adjacent public roads. The DSP provides a dumpster and a loading space that are located in the north part of the site. The loading space is located close to the rear part of the building. Since the building is in a “T” shape footprint with the wide part fronting Baltimore Avenue, the loading space is screened by the building from the views from Baltimore Avenue. The proposed dumpster will be screened with a metal clad gate and a six-foot-high brick wall that will match the brick pattern of the hotel building.

11. **The Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance:** This property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George’s County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because the site has a previously approved Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/65/04.

- a. The forest stand delineation (FSD) was reviewed with the previous approval and was found to meet the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance. No further action regarding the forest stand delineation is required with this DSP.
- b. The Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/176/06, submitted with this DSP has been reviewed and was found to be consistent with the previously approved Type I tree conservation plan and in general conform to the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance.

12. **Referral Comments:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:

- a. The Community Planning Division in a memorandum dated November 20, 2007, indicated that the application is consistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern Policies for Corridors in the Developed Tier, and conforms to the land use recommendations of the 2002 *Approved College Park US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* for a mix of retail/commercial and office uses in Subarea 5b (Autoville Drive Mixed-Use Area) and 6a (North Gateway Mixed Commercial Area). The community planner also noted that the application has doubled the amount of permitted off-street parking and maintained a setback that is outside of the normal range required by the DDOZ standards for Type II Street Edges (on Page 187 of the sector plan).

Comment: As discussed previously, an amendment to the parking standards has been requested by the applicant. Given that the majority of the off-street parking will be located within the underground parking garage, the site is located close to the Beltway, and shuttle service will be provided for hotel guests, staff agrees that the amendment will not substantially impair the sector plan but will benefit this development.

As far as the setback is concerned, due to the footprint of the proposed building, a small part of the building frontage is sited four feet further from the ultimate right-of-way than the maximum allowed build-to-line. The intent of the build-to-line along with the percentage of site frontage to be occupied by the building is to establish a continuous street wall along this section of Baltimore Avenue. Since most of the site's frontage will be occupied by the same building elevation within the allowable build-to-line range, the intent of the build-to-line has been met.

- b. The Transportation Planning Section in a memorandum dated February 16, 2007, provided a summary of the possible traffic impacts that this DSP will have on the US 1 Corridor. The Transportation Planner concludes that the level-of-service (LOS) standard required by the Development District Overlay Zone of the US 1 Sector Plan will be achieved. The Transportation Planning Section indicates that an access easement from the proposed parking garage to the existing access easement connection when Autoville Drive is extended to intersect with Baltimore Avenue at a location directly opposite Hollywood Road is required in accordance with the US 1 Sector Plan.

Comment: A condition has been proposed in the recommendation section to require the applicant to provide the required connection prior to certification of this DSP.

In a separate memorandum from the Transportation Planning Section dated February 5, 2007, on detailed site plan review for master plan trail compliance, the trails planner provided a comprehensive review of the trail-related development district overlay zone standards that are applicable to this DSP. The trails planner recommends two conditions of approval that have been incorporated into the recommendation section of this report.

- c. The Subdivision Section in a memorandum dated December 3, 2007, noted that the subject site has an approved preliminary plan of subdivision and is subject to two conditions attached to the approval. See above Finding 8 for a detailed discussion on the DSP's conformance with the previous conditions of approval.
- d. In a memorandum dated October 17, 2007, the Environmental Planning Section recommended approval of this DSP with two conditions which have been incorporated into the recommendation of this report.
- e. The Permit Section in a memorandum dated October 17, 2007, provided five comments and questions regarding compliance with the sector plan and development district standards, signage and building dimensions. All comments have been addressed during the review process.
- f. At the time this staff report was written, the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) had not yet responded to the referral request. However, since Baltimore Avenue is under the jurisdiction of the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) and the site is located within the City of College Park, it is not

expected that DPW&T will have substantive comments, as has been the case in similar applications in the past.

- g. The City Council of the City of College approved this detailed site plan on August 12, 2008, with eight conditions. Conditions 3, 4, 5(b), and 6, which are supplemental to the conditions proposed by the staff, have been incorporated into the recommendation of this report.
- h. In a memorandum dated June 30, 2008, the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) recommended approval of this DSP. However, the memorandum states that the dedication area shown on the site plans along the property fronting US 1 (Baltimore Avenue) appears to be in conflict with the future upgrade of US 1.

Comment: A review by the Subdivision Section (Lockard to Zhang, December 3, 2007) concludes that the lot layout, road configuration, and point of access are in conformance with that shown on the approved preliminary plan. The proposed public utility easements (PUE) are also shown correctly. According to the approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-05012 for this site, the applicant should demonstrate dedication of at least 55 feet from the existing centerline along US 1. Staff has found that the required dedication has been shown correctly on the site plan.

- i. At the time this staff report was written, neither the City of Berwyn Heights nor the City of Greenbelt had yet responded to the referral request.
13. 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, and complies with the Development District Overlay Zone standards of the 2002 Approved College Park US 1 Corridor Sector Plan without requiring unreasonable cost and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the foregoing evaluation and analysis, the Urban Design staff recommends: (a) that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report, and (b) that the Planning Board forward a recommendation of APPROVAL of the application to the District Council as follows:

- A. Recommends APPROVAL of the request to rezone approximately 0.9 acre in the C-S-C (Commercial Shopping Center) Zone to the M-U-I (Mixed Use-Infill) Zone.
- B. Recommends APPROVAL of a 25.5-foot variance from the side yard setback regulations of Section 27-462 to allow the proposed building to be sited five feet from the property line.
- C. Recommends APPROVAL of the alternative development district standards for:
 - 1. P1. Road Network, B. (to allow the application not to provide on-street parking)
 - 2. P6. Utilities, A. (to allow the applicant to retain the existing utility pole at the current location without relocating underground)

3. S2. Parking Areas, W. (to allow an additional 37 parking spaces above the maximum allowable number of parking spaces to be provided on site; but within an underground parking garage and with shuttle bus service to the campus of the University of Maryland to minimize vehicle trips to the south along the US 1 Corridor)
 4. S3. Building Siting and Setbacks, C. (to allow the small southern portion of the building to be set back approximately 24 feet from the ultimate right-of-way of Baltimore Avenue which is 4 feet more than the maximum allowed by the build-to-line requirement for this subarea)
- D. Recommends APPROVAL of DSP-06018, for TownePlace Suites by Marriott, and Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/176/06, subject to the following conditions:
1. Prior to certificate approval of this detailed site plan, the applicant shall:
 - a. Provide brick wall segments and wall detail on the site plan.
 - b. Provide an access easement from the proposed parking garage to the existing access easement to the south of the site when Autoville Drive is extended to intersect with Baltimore Avenue at a location directly opposite of Hollywood Road.
 - c. Provide additional information and details for the following items to be reviewed by the Urban Design Section in consultation with the City of College Park.
 - (1) Additional planters in front of the hotel.
 - (2) Street furniture.
 - (3) Create an urban street edge by enlarging the patio area and providing additional street furniture, relocate the bench adjacent to an entry door, and provide a trash receptacle at the new bench location.
 - (4) A sign plan that specifies standards including lighting, colors, lettering style, size, height, quantity and location.
 - d. Provide revisions to the architectural elevations as follows:
 - (1) Carry the brick up the full height of the projecting gables on the north, south, and east façades to replace the fiber cement siding.
 - (2) Eliminate the EIFS panels and replace with fiber cement siding.
 - (3) On the west façade eliminate the brick that surrounds the two upper windows.
 - (4) Provide revised calculations for brick percentages.
 2. The applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide the following sidewalk improvements:
 - a. Provide a five-foot-wide sidewalk, separated from the curb by a landscaped strip, along with the site's frontage of US 1, unless modified by SHA.
 - b. Provide a standard sidewalk along the subject site's entire frontage of Autoville Drive, unless modified by the City of College Park.

- c. All sidewalks shall include ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) accessible ramps and curb cuts at all road intersections.
- 3. All afforestation notes and details shall be provided on the TCPII. All plants proposed shall be native plant species. The outermost edge of the planting area shall contain trees of a minimum of one inch caliper. The TCPII notes regarding the responsibility of maintenance for all afforestation areas shall also be provided.
- 4. Prior to issuance of any building permits, the applicant shall:
 - a. Install split rail fence along the outer edge of all reforestation/afforestation areas. A certification prepared by a qualified professional may be used to provide verification that the afforestation has been completed. The applicant shall also submit photos identifying the locations and a plan showing the locations where the photos were taken.
 - b. Provide the following improvements regarding the access and frontage improvements subject to final approval of SHA as follows:
 - (1) Narrow the driveway entrance to a maximum of 30 feet in width with a maximum radius of 15 feet.
 - (2) Restrict turning movements to right-in and right-out.
 - (3) Construct the US 1 frontage, including road widening, removal of existing sidewalk and installation of new curb and gutter, as well as extension of the median.
- 5. Prior to issuance of building permit, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide a contribution in the amount of \$5,000 toward undergrounding the existing utilities. The City of College Park shall establish an escrow account to manage the contribution.