



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

**Detailed Site Plan
 Variance Request
 Alternative Compliance**

**DSP-09021
 VD-09021
 AC-10011**

Application	General Data	
Project Name: Inglewood Business Park, Largo Fairfield Inn Hotel Location: Southwest of the intersection of Lottsford Court and Lottsford Road. Applicant/Address: The Brittnelle Development Group, LLC 4906 Forest Creek Court Bowie, MD 20720	Planning Board Hearing Date:	06/10/10
	Staff Report Date:	05/26/10
	Date Accepted:	03/31/10
	Planning Board Action Limit:	Waived
	Plan Acreage:	3.58
	Zone:	I-3
	Dwelling Units:	NA
	Gross Floor Area:	55,238 sq. ft.
	Planning Area:	73
	Tier:	Developing
	Council District:	06
	Election District	13
	Municipality:	N/A
200-Scale Base Map:	202NE08	

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates	
Detailed site plan approval to construct a hotel with 120 rooms and a variance approval from I-3 Zone yard and parking setback requirements	Informational Mailing:	07/29/09
	Acceptance Mailing:	03/30/10
	Sign Posting Deadline:	05/11/10

Staff Recommendation		Staff Reviewer: Jill Kosack	
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-09021
Variance Request VD-09021
Alternative Compliance AC-10011
Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/010/10
Inglewood Business Park, Largo Fairfield Inn Hotel

The Urban Design staff has reviewed the detailed site plan, variance, and alternative compliance for the subject property and presents the following evaluation and findings leading to a recommendation of APPROVAL with conditions, as described in the recommendation section of this report.

EVALUATION

The detailed site plan (DSP) was reviewed and evaluated for conformance with the following criteria:

- a. The requirements of the Zoning Ordinance in the Planned Industrial/Employment Park (I-3) Zone.
- b. The requirements of Section 27-230 of the Zoning Ordinance regarding criteria for granting variances.
- c. The requirements of Conceptual Site Plan SP-80034.
- d. The requirements of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-95122.
- e. The requirements of the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*.
- f. The requirements of the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance.
- g. Referral comments.

FINDINGS

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

1. **Request:** This application includes a request for approval of a hotel with 120 rooms on 3.58 acres in the I-3 Zone. The companion application, Variance Request VD-09021, requests a variance

from Section 27-474(b), Footnotes 2 and 3, of the Zoning Ordinance to allow a reduced building and parking setback. Per Section 27-474(b), the required building setback is a total of 73.75 feet from all property lines, of which 50 percent may be used for surface parking and loading areas. The companion application, Departure from Design Standards DDS-598, requests a departure from Section 27-558(a) of the Zoning Ordinance to allow the size for all of the standard, nonparallel parking spaces to be reduced to 9 feet in width by 18 feet in length.

2. **Development Data Summary**

	Existing	Proposed
Zones	I-3	I-3
Uses	Vacant	Hotel with 120 Rooms
Acreage	3.58	3.58
Lots	1 (Lot 51)	1 (Lot 51)
Parcels	0	0
Square Footage/GFA	0	55,238

Other Development Data

	Required	Proposed
Parking:		
Hotel with 120 Rooms	60	91 (4 Handicapped)
Total	60	91 (4 Handicapped)

3. **Location:** The subject site is located on the south side of Lottsford Court, approximately 600 feet southwest of its intersection with Lottsford Road, and less than one mile from the Largo Town Center Metro Station within Planning Area 73, Council District 6, and the Developing Tier.
4. **Surrounding Uses:** The site is part of the existing Inglewood Restaurant Park and is surrounded by property in the I-3 Zone, including a vacant lot, which has an approved Detailed Site Plan (DSP-05055) for a bank, to the southeast; a developed industrial site to the south; Lottsford Court to the northeast; an existing parking lot for the adjacent sit-down restaurant, Jasper’s, to the northwest; and a vacant lot to the west which has an approved Detailed Site Plan (DSP-06094) for commercial office space.
5. **Previous Approvals:** In June 1980, the Planning Board approved Conceptual Site Plan SP-80034 for the 228.56-acre Inglewood Business Community, including this property, subject to five conditions. In January 1996, the Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-95122 (PGCPB Resolution No. 96-22) for the Inglewood Restaurant Park property, subject to seven conditions. A final plat was recorded pursuant to that approval at VJ 175 @ 30, showing five lots. The subject property, Lot 51, was never developed. The following is the list of approvals on the remaining four lots within Inglewood Restaurant Park: Lot 50, B.E.T. Soundstage (currently Jasper’s Restaurant) SP-95102 (PGCPB Resolution No. 96-49); Lot 48, Outback Steakhouse DSP-01025 (PGCPB Resolution No. 01-133); Lot 49, Ruby Tuesday DSP-02020 (PGCPB Resolution No. 02-145); and Lot 52, Citizen’s Bank DSP-05055 (PGCPB Resolution No. 05-264). All of these lots have been developed and are in use, except for Lot 52 which still remains vacant.

6. **Design Features:** The subject detailed site plan proposes the construction of a four-story, 120-room hotel, and associated 91-space parking lot on Lot 51. The subject property is irregularly shaped and about one-third of its area, along the southern and western property lines, is located in a platted conservation and floodplain easement. This lot is within the existing, developed Inglewood Restaurant Park, which has a unique design including shared-access drives bisected by common property lines. The front of the hotel is proposed to be oriented towards the rear of vacant Lot 52 and Lottsford Road beyond it. A parking field, including four handicapped spaces, is located in the front of the hotel along with the porte cochere entrance area to the hotel. The remaining parking is provided to the rear of the hotel and will be accessed from the parking compound of the Jasper's Restaurant on Lot 50, which is immediately contiguous to the north and northwest. There is an existing cross access easement for the restaurant park which will allow access to these parking spaces. A trash dumpster will also be located in the southwest corner of this rear parking compound. A masonry-block retaining wall is proposed around the southern corner of the building in order to prevent grading into environmental features in this area. Stormwater management will be accommodated on-site in two hydrodynamic facilities, which are underground, flow-through structures with settling or separation units to treat storm water.

The proposed hotel building will be four stories and 63.75 feet high. The overwhelming majority of the exterior will be constructed of two different colored bricks in a pattern complementary to the façade divisions. Additional accent bands of bricks running in a horizontal direction are proposed along the ground level of the building elevations. A small amount of exterior insulation and finishing system (EIFS) is proposed at certain locations along the eave line and within the central area of each building elevation, continuing to the ground level. To ensure the level of architectural quality and prevent future maintenance concerns, it is recommended that EIFS be removed from the ground level of the building on all elevations and replaced with brick. A condition has been incorporated in the recommendation section of this report which would require this revision to the plan prior to certification. The roof of the building will consist of dimensional shingles and has several different angles and slopes to add interest. A blue, standing-seam, metal roof is used in a few locations to highlight certain architectural features.

Standard, franchise-style, Fairfield Inn building-mounted signage is proposed on all building elevations. One monument sign is proposed in an island facing the Lottsford Court frontage. The proposed signs are not in conformance with the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and this issue is discussed further in Finding 7.c.

The site plan shows a proposed sun deck area to the rear of the hotel along with some minimal landscaping between the building and surrounding parking areas. Staff recommends that additional landscaping be added to the area immediately surrounding the hotel in keeping with the residential nature of the use. A condition has been incorporated in the recommendation section of this report which would require additional landscaping to include, but not be limited to, shade trees, ornamental trees, evergreen shrubs, and annual and/or perennial planting beds, be added to the plan in this area prior to certification. To satisfy the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* requirements, new plant materials will also be added within the parking compound and along the southeastern property line. The existing woodland at the southern and western portion of the site is to remain largely undisturbed.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **Zoning Ordinance:** The subject application has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements in the Planned Industrial/Employment Park (I-3) Zone and the site plan design guidelines of the Zoning Ordinance. A hotel use is permitted in the I-3 Zone in an industrial park having a gross tract area of at least 25 acres. The Inglewood Business Community, of which Lot 51 is a part, is 228.56 acres.
- a. The proposal was reviewed for conformance to the requirements of Section 27-471. The plan is in conformance with all of the requirements, except for 27-471(f)(2) which indicates the following:

Not more than twenty-five (25%) of any parking lot and no loading space shall be located in the yard to which the building's main entrance is oriented, except that the Planning Board may approve up to an additional fifteen percent (15%) in its discretion if increased parking better serves the efficiency of the particular use; improves views from major arteries or interstate highways; and makes better use of existing topography or complements the architectural design of the building.

Comment: This proposal shows a 91-space parking lot, of which 25 percent would allow 22 spaces to be located in the front of the hotel building. Approximately 34 spaces are proposed to be located in the yard to which the building's main entrance is oriented. This falls within the 15 percent increase which the Planning Board is authorized to approve (40 percent of 91 spaces equates to 36 spaces). A formal variance request is not required for this approval, as the Planning Board may approve this increase at its discretion.

Applicant's Justification: The applicant provided the following summarized justification in response to this increase request:

“The applicant states that the irregular shape of the property, as well as the impact of the environmental areas, restricts the portion of the property that is available for development. The hotel has been sited in a way that necessitates that the parking spaces be distributed equally between the front and rear of the building. While doorway accesses are located on the sides and rear elevations of the building, the major entrance will be oriented to the front of the building. As such, hotel patrons will want to park in the front of the building as it promotes ease of access and an enhanced sense of safety. Given this fact, allowing the increase of parking in front of the building serves the efficiency of the hotel use. Allowing the building to be oriented in the manner being proposed, which impacts the area available for parking compounds, will improve the views into the property for motorists traveling along the major roadway in this area, Landover Road (MD Route 202). Additionally, the building orientation and parking field layout minimizes the impact to the existing environmental features located along the southern boundary of the property.”

Comment: Staff concurs with the applicant's assertion that an increase of parking in front of the hotel better serves the efficiency of this particular use and allows for a building orientation that improves the view into the property from major arteries and makes better use of the existing topography. Staff recommends that the Planning Board exercise its discretion and approve the increase to allow a maximum of 40 percent of any parking lot and no loading space to be located in the yard to which the building's main

entrance is oriented. A condition has been incorporated in the recommendation section of this report which would require a note to this effect be added to the plan prior to certification.

- b. The proposal is in conformance with the requirements of Section 27-474 regarding regulations in the I-3 Zone, except for 27-474(b).

Per Section 27-474(b), the required building setback from adjoining land in any nonresidential zone shall be 20 feet. However, Footnote 11 allows that, when a property is located within one mile of any land owned by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) and used as a rail transit station, the minimum setback from any street, except a freeway, and in all yards from adjoining land in any nonresidential zone shall be ten feet. This property is within one mile of the Largo Town Center Metro Station, therefore the setback is ten feet. However, Footnote 2 requires that an additional one foot be added to the setback for each foot of building height, up to a maximum of 75 feet. The proposed hotel is 63.75 feet tall which would require a total setback of 73.75 feet from all property lines. Footnote 3 states that the setback requirement applies to “surface parking and loading areas, except that 50 percent of the additional required yard (created under Footnote 1 or 2) may be used for surface parking.”

The applicant was unclear as to how Footnote 3 is to be interpreted and applied in regards to how the 50 percent is to be calculated. Specifically, is it to be calculated in square footage terms or by the number of linear feet of parking which intrude into the yard.

Comment: Staff reviewed previous approvals, as listed in Finding 5 above, for the adjacent lots within the Inglewood Restaurant Park as to their interpretation of Footnote 3. All of these approvals interpreted Footnote 3 to provide a 50 percent reduction of the additional linear foot setback requirement, due to the height of the building, to the parking lot edge. Therefore, a reduction of 50 percent from the building height of 63.75 feet would be 31.88 feet, plus the initial ten-foot setback requirement, which would mean a total required setback of 41.88 linear feet from the property line to any parking lot.

The applicant has submitted an application for a Variance Request, VD-09021, from Footnotes 2 and 3 of Section 27-474(b).

The variance from Footnote 2 would allow for a reduction in the required building setback of 73.75 feet from the northwestern and southern property lines. The site plan shows a building setback of 24.2 feet from the northwestern property line, which the applicant rounds up to a variance of 50 feet, and a building setback of 49.62 feet from the southern property line, which the applicant rounds up to a variance of 25 feet.

Comment: Staff notes that along the southern property line, the site plan shows a retaining wall, which is proposed to be over six feet in height, and therefore, would be required to meet the setback requirements of main buildings per Section 27-465(a) of the Zoning Ordinance. The retaining wall is shown as set back approximately 38 feet from the southern property line, which would require a variance of 36 feet. A condition has been incorporated in the recommendation section of this report which would require a dimension be provided on the site plan from the property line to the retaining wall and to list the approved variances in the general notes.

The variance from Footnote 3 would allow for a reduction in the required parking lot setback of 41.88 feet. The applicant requests a variance from the full requirement along all property lines; however, a parking lot setback is shown along the southeastern and southern property lines on the site plan.

Comment: Staff concurs with the applicant's request for consideration of a variance from the full parking lot setback requirement along the northwestern and northern property lines, where an existing shared-access drive is located across the property line, which leads directly into the proposed hotel parking lot. Staff recommends that only a partial variance from the full parking lot setback be considered along the southeastern and southern property lines. The proposed site plan shows an approximate 15-foot parking lot setback from the southeastern property line and an approximate 40-foot parking lot setback from the southern property line. To allow room for error during construction, staff recommends a variance of 30 feet along the southeastern property line and a variance of ten feet along the southern property line.

Section 27-230(a) of the Zoning Ordinance sets forth the following required findings for approval of a variance:

- (1) **A specific parcel of land has exceptional narrowness, shallowness, or shape, exceptional topographic conditions, or other extraordinary situations or conditions;**

Applicant's Justification: The applicant provided the following summarized justification in response to this requirement:

“There is no question that the property has exceptional narrowness, shallowness and shape. It also has exceptional topographic conditions due to the substantial impact of the environmentally sensitive areas. What is also extraordinary about the property is its relatively narrow frontage on Lottsford Court when compared to the overall size of the property.”

Comment: Staff concurs with the applicant's assertion that the environmental areas and irregular lot shape are unique constraints on the subject property and contribute to a condition that limits the area available for siting a building and parking lot.

Staff would also like to note that the I-3 Zone is the only industrial zone which has many special requirements which were set with the expectation that the land would be utilized as a campus-like industrial or office park. The initial approval of the Inglewood Restaurant Park, with its unique design of building orientation and shared access and parking lots, departed from the type of development normally contemplated in the I-3 Zone and thus left the subject site in a unique situation. The previous detailed site plans within this restaurant park all had variances, of different amounts, from the setback requirements as part of their approvals. An approval of setback variances in this case would continue the compact and shared type of development that already exists within this restaurant park.

- (2) **The strict application of this Subtitle will result in peculiar and unusual practical difficulties to, or exceptional or undue hardship upon, the owner of the property; and**

Applicant's Justification: The applicant provided the following summarized justification in response to this requirement:

“If the provisions of Footnotes 2 and 3 were to be strictly applied in this instance, the applicant would effectively be precluded from constructing a hotel on its property. This is primarily due to the extraordinary shape of the property. Due to the manner in which the property narrows in the middle, the short and acute angles comprising the property boundaries along the north and northwest edges, and the impact of environmentally sensitive areas, there is really only one portion of the property, a very small portion at that, where the hotel can be sited and constructed. Even this area of the property has an unusual shape and imposes its own constraints due to that shape. Strict application of the setbacks and development limitations imposed by Footnotes 2 and 3 will effectively prevent the applicant from constructing a hotel of any reasonable size on the property. This is particularly true when it is considered that if the applicant chose to increase the number of floors of the hotel in order to reduce the footprint, the required yard areas would simply increase due to Footnote 2, thus creating the need for even larger variances.”

Comment: Staff concurs with the applicant's assertion that the strict application of the building and parking lot setbacks would result in a practical difficulty of making it nearly impossible to site a hotel on this uniquely-shaped lot.

(3) The variance will not substantially impair the intent, purpose, or integrity of the General Plan or Master Plan.

Applicant's Justification: The applicant provided the following summarized justification in response to this requirement:

“The General Plan places this property in the developing tier and the Largo-Lottsford and Vicinity Approved Master Plan recommends development of the property as part of a planned employment park pursuant to the I-3 Zone. Therefore, development of this site with a hotel, which is permitted as a matter of right in the I-3 Zone, will in no way impair the intent, purpose, or integrity of the General Plan or Master Plan. Furthermore, even though the developable area of the subject property is severely constrained, the property is of an ample size and the overall appearance, given that the sensitive environmental features will be preserved, will create an aura of expansiveness and openness. In effect, the property will be under-developed as opposed to over-developed.”

Comment: Staff concurs with the applicant's assertion that the variance will not impair the intent, purpose, or integrity of the 2002 *Prince George's County Approved General Plan* or the 1990 *Approved Master Plan and Adopted Sectional Map Amendment for Largo-Lottsford, Planning Area 73*.

- c. The detailed site plan submittal contains several proposed signs that are not in conformance with the signage requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. The applicant will be required to submit and obtain approval of a departure from sign design standards (DSDS) before these signs can be included as part of the certified detailed site plan.

Per Section 27-613(b)(2), all building-mounted signs in the I-3 Zone shall not extend above the lowest point of the roof of the building to which it is attached. All of the building-mounted signs shown on the architecture are located above the lowest point of the roof. Further review of this issue will be done at the time of DSDS; however, staff notes that adjacent Lot 48, Outback Steakhouse, and Lot 49, Ruby Tuesday, have both been approved for departures from this same requirement through DSDS-579 and DSDS-592, respectively.

Per Section 27-613(c)(4), the area of all signs mounted on a building wall facing a street in the I-3 Zone shall be not more than one square foot for each one lineal foot of building width facing that street. The north elevation of the building, which faces Lottsford Court, is 44 feet in width and has a building-mounted sign that is 50.625 square feet, which is larger than the allowed 44 square feet. Although it is not immediately adjoining, this north building elevation also faces Landover Road, MD 202. The adjacent Jasper's Restaurant on Lot 50, which was approved through SP-95102, included a condition of approval for adjacent Lots 48 and 49 (previously 1 and 2, respectively) that prohibited building signage on the elevation parallel to and directly facing MD 202. Subsequently, when the Citizen's Bank on adjacent Lot 52 was going through the detailed site plan process, DSP-05055, the Planning Board added a condition to the approval that revised the building elevation to eliminate the building sign facing MD 202. Since the Planning Board has historically decided not to allow building-mounted signs facing MD 202 within the Inglewood Restaurant Park, staff recommends that this application, on Lot 52, should be held to a similar requirement. A condition has been incorporated in the recommendation section of this report which would require this revision to the plans prior to certification and would thereby eliminate the need for a DSDS for the size of the building-mounted sign on the north elevation.

Per Section 27-614(c)(4), the area of a freestanding sign shall be not more than one square foot for each five lineal feet of street frontage along the street on which the sign faces. In this application, a freestanding sign of approximately 20.30 square feet is proposed in an island facing Lottsford Court. Lot 52 has a street frontage of 81.32 feet, which would only allow a maximum signage area of 16.26 square feet.

A condition has been incorporated in the recommendation section of this report which would require approval of a DSDS prior to certification for the two issues discussed above.

8. **Conceptual Site Plan SP-80034:** On June 26, 1980, the Planning Board approved Conceptual Site Plan SP-80034 subject to five conditions, of which the following are applicable to the review of this detailed site plan and warrant discussion as follows:

1. **The concerns of the Environmental Planning Division and the S.H.A. regarding stormwater management and floodplain delineation shall be addressed on the preliminary plan and/or site development plan.**

Comment: An approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan, 24888-2009, was submitted with the detailed site plan application, which the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) found needed to be revised to reflect the current layout shown on the site plan. A condition has been incorporated in the recommendation section of this report which would require this revision prior to certification of the detailed site plan. A floodplain easement across Lot 51 was platted at the time of record plat and this site plan reflects that easement line.

3. **The issues of a possible storage or storage and inspection yard at the terminus of Metro's Blue Line shall be resolved to the satisfaction of the Planning Board prior to approval of any preliminary plan beyond Phase I (Lots 1-9).**

Comment: The Transportation Planning Section has reviewed the plan and stated that the extension of Metro's Blue Line has been built, and no additional yard facilities were determined to be needed.

4. **A traffic study shall be submitted by the applicant for review prior to approval of any preliminary plan beyond Phase I (Lots 1-9).**

Comment: The Transportation Planning Section has reviewed the plan and stated that a traffic study that included the subject site was done and reviewed at the time of preliminary plan.

9. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-95122:** On January 18, 1996, the Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-95122 (PGCPB Resolution No. 96-22) subject to seven conditions, of which the following are applicable to the review of this detailed site plan and warrant discussion as follows:

2. **Development of this subdivision shall be in accordance with the approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan, Concept #900077.**

Comment: An approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan, 24888-2009, was submitted with the detailed site plan application. The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed the plan and stated that, due to the new stormwater management regulations, it is possible that the stormwater management concept plan may need to be revised at the time of technical approval. At the time of permit review, the technical stormwater management plan will be evaluated for conformance to the detailed site plan.

3. **At the time of Final Plat(s), the Patuxent River Primary Management Area Preservation Area shall be placed into a Conservation Easement. However, those areas within the conservation easement for which a variation request has been granted may be disturbed for purposes of the construction and installation of sewer lines, water lines, storm drainage facilities and other infrastructure.**

Comment: The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed the plan and stated that the current plan proposes no disturbance to the recorded conservation easement except for a sewer outfall extending to the existing sewer right-of-way within the 100-year floodplain. Because the location of this outfall is placed to minimize impacts to the primary management area and is necessary for development of this site, the Environmental Planning Section recommends this minor disturbance to the conservation easement be approved as part of this detailed site plan.

The Environmental Planning Section recommends that the Planning Board find that the minor disturbance to the platted conservation easement to provide for a sewer outfall on the site to the existing sewer right-of-way within the 100-year floodplain, as shown on the detailed site plan, is appropriate and should be approved as part of this application.

4. **The applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assigns, shall construct the Master Plan trail along the subject property’s frontage along Lottsford Road. The type of trail and timing of its construction shall be determined at the time of Detailed Site Plan for lots abutting Lottsford Road.**

Comment: Lot 51 does not front on Lottsford Road.

5. **Prior to the issuance of a Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) permit for the construction of Street A, a Declaration of Covenants (subject to review and approval by DPW&T) for the maintenance responsibility for Street A shall be recorded among the County Land Records.**

Comment: According to the Subdivision Section, the site plan shows that Street A, which is now Lottsford Court, has been constructed and dedicated to public use.

6. **Development on this site shall be limited to a 11,950-square foot quality restaurant, 14,000 square feet of high turnover restaurant space, 3,750 square feet of fast food restaurant space and a 12-pump service station with convenience market and car wash within the subject property, or other permitted uses which generate no more than 404 AM and 374 PM peak hour trips as determined under the Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals (April 1989). Development beyond the limits set by this condition shall require a new Preliminary Plat of Subdivision and a new finding of adequate public facilities for transportation. To provide evidence of compliance with the overall trip cap of 404 AM and 374 PM peak hour trips, each Detailed Site Plan submitted for development within any portion of the subject property shall indicate the total approved development, stated in square feet of gross floor area, prior to and including the date of the submission of the site plan. The Transportation Planning staff shall analyze each site plan application using the most current estimate of trip generation.**

Comment: This site plan proposes a 55,238-square-foot hotel which is different from the proposed uses analyzed with Preliminary Plan 4-95122. The Transportation Planning Section reviewed the trip cap issue and provided the following analysis of the subject application:

The five lots developed under Preliminary Plan 4-95122 have an overall trip cap of 404 AM and 374 PM trips. During the review of DSP-05055 for adjacent Lot 52, an extended analysis was done of the previously approved uses within the subdivision. Consistent with that analysis, the following table has been prepared to summarize the approved and proposed uses for the site.

Development Type	Development Quantity	Status	AM Trip Generation	PM Trip Generation
Lots 48, 49, and 50: restaurant	26,145 sq. ft.	Built	21	200
Lot 52: drive-in bank	3,500 sq. ft.	DSP-05055	32	68
Lot 51: hotel	120 rooms	DSP-09021	78	96
Total			131	364

The trip generation makes allowance for pass-by traffic for the restaurant and bank uses, and utilizes the most recent published trip generation rates. Therefore, it is determined that the development within the area of the preliminary plan is within the trip cap established by Condition 6 of the resolution for Preliminary Plan 4-95122.

7. Prior to the approval of the Final Plat(s), the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) shall provide written approval of the modified right-of-way configuration for Street A.

Comment: The Transportation Planning Section has reviewed the plan and stated that this condition requires written approval of DPW&T for a modified right-of-way configuration for Street A (now Lottsford Court). All needed documentation was furnished prior to final plat.

10. **Prince George’s County Landscape Manual:** The proposed development is subject to Sections 4.3.a., Parking Lot Landscaped Strip; 4.3.b., Parking Lot Perimeter Landscape Strip; and 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses.

Alternative compliance was requested from Section 4.3.b. along the northwestern property line. The Planning Director has endorsed the Alternative Compliance Committee’s recommendation of approval of this request. The committee’s recommendation is as follows:

Request—The subject application is for a 120-room hotel and associated parking lot within the existing Inglewood Restaurant Park. The subject property measures approximately 3.58 acres and is zoned I-3 (Planned Industrial/Employment Park). The site is surrounded by property in the I-3 Zone, including a vacant lot, which has an approved Detailed Site Plan (DSP-05055) for a bank, to the southeast; a developed industrial site to the south; Lottsford Court to the northeast; an existing parking lot for the adjacent sit-down restaurant use, Jasper’s, to the northwest; and a vacant lot to the west which has an approved Detailed Site Plan (DSP-06094) for commercial office space.

The site is subject to Sections 4.3.a., Parking Lot Landscaped Strip; 4.3.b., Parking Lot Perimeter Landscape Strip; and 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, of the *Prince George’s County Landscape Manual*. The applicant has filed this request for alternative compliance from Section 4.3.b. to allow for a reduced parking lot perimeter landscape strip along the property line where the proposed hotel’s parking lot is adjacent to Lot 50.

REQUIRED: 4.3.b. Parking Lot Perimeter Landscape Strip, along the northwestern property line.

Length of parking lot perimeter	503.05 feet
Width of landscaped strip	5 feet
Shade trees (1 per 35 l. f.)	15
Shrubs (3 per 35 l. f.)	44

PROVIDED: 4.3.b. Parking Lot Perimeter Landscape Strip

Length of parking lot perimeter (excluding driveway openings)	241.5 feet (48% of required)
Width of landscaped strip	Varies, 5–20 feet
Shade trees	11 (1 existing tree)
Shrubs	136

Justification of Recommendation—The underlying detailed site plan proposes the construction of a 55,328-square-foot, 120-room hotel, and a 91-space parking lot. Section 4.3.b. Parking Lot Perimeter Landscape Strip applies to this site and is required along the northwestern property line adjoining Lot 50. Normal conformance would require a five-foot-wide landscaped strip along the entire edge with one shade tree and three shrubs for every 35 linear feet of parking lot adjacent to the property line. The applicant is requesting relief due to the existing parking lot layout on adjacent Lot 50, which includes a shared-access drive across the existing property line. The proposed hotel parking lot has multiple driveway openings onto this access drive, cutting across the area where a parking lot perimeter landscape strip would normally be required. The applicant is requesting approval of planting islands, varying five feet to 20 feet wide in lieu of a parking lot perimeter landscape strip, for approximately 48 percent of the required length. These islands are located approximately 10 to 15 feet off of the property line. The applicant also proposes to provide an amount of plant material in excess of what would be required within a full required perimeter strip area.

The subject site is part of the existing Inglewood Restaurant Park that uses common access drives across property lines within the middle of shared-parking facilities to create a design treatment of the property as one entity, instead of as individual lots. Other sites within the restaurant park have had alternative compliance approved for Section 4.3.b. because of this unique character as part of their detailed site plan approvals. For example, the adjacent Jasper’s Restaurant on Lot 50 was developed in accordance with Special Permit 95102 with an approved Alternative Compliance, AC-96007, which provided relief from Section 4.3.b. along its property lines adjacent to Ruby Tuesday, Outback Steakhouse, and the proposed hotel site. The nearby Outback Steakhouse was developed in accordance with Detailed Site Plan DSP-01025 with an approved Alternative Compliance, AC-01001, for relief from Section 4.3.b. along its property line adjacent to Ruby Tuesday. The nearby Ruby Tuesday restaurant was developed in accordance with Detailed Site Plan DSP-02020 with an approved Alternative Compliance, AC-02013, for relief from Section 4.3.b. along its property line adjacent to Outback Steakhouse. These approvals used a similar design approach by providing perimeter landscaping where possible and then by providing additional landscaping within the parking lot islands and around the outside of the parking lot.

The Alternative Compliance Committee finds this application to be substantially similar to the alternative compliance approvals on the other sites within the Inglewood Restaurant Park. Therefore, the committee feels the design approach of landscape islands with additional plant material along the northwestern property line will fulfill the objective of the perimeter landscape strip in a way equal to or better than normal compliance with the *Prince George’s County Landscape Manual*.

Recommendation—The Alternative Compliance Committee recommends approval of alternative compliance pursuant to Section 4.3.b. of the *Prince George’s County Landscape Manual* along the northwestern property line for Largo Fairfield Inn with the following conditions:

1. The 4.3.b. Parking Lot Perimeter Landscape Strip schedule on Sheet 15 of 15 of the site plan shall be revised to indicate the length and width of the landscaping area being provided within the parking lot islands and shall clearly indicate dimensions on plan Sheet 14.
2. The 4.3.b. Parking Lot Perimeter Landscape Strip schedule on Sheet 15 of 15 of the site plan shall be revised to remove the five ornamental trees from the list of plants provided, as these are not located between the parking lot and property line and therefore, should not count toward fulfilling this requirement.

3. Sheet 14 of the site plan shall be revised to show the proposed tree line and to provide a dimension of the minimum landscaped yard provided along the southern property line for the “B” bufferyard.
11. **Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance:** This property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George’s County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance because it is greater than 40,000 square feet in gross tract area, there are more than 10,000 square feet of existing woodland, and more than 5,000 square feet of woodland clearing is proposed. A Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII/010/10) was submitted with the detailed site plan application. The woodland conservation threshold for the site is 0.33 acre and the total requirement shown on the TCP worksheet is 0.33 acre. The TCPII proposes to meet the requirement with 0.10 acre of on-site woodland preservation, 0.13 acre of afforestation/reforestation, and payment of a fee-in-lieu for 0.16 acre of woodlands. The proposed TCPII is in conformance with the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance.
 12. **Referral Comments:** The subject applications were referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:
 - a. **Community Planning:** The Community Planning North Division provided the following analysis of the proposal:

The application is consistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies for employment areas within the Developing Tier.

The application conforms to the land use recommendations of the 1990 *Approved Master Plan and Adopted Sectional Map Amendment for Largo-Lottsford, Planning Area 73* for employment-related development at this site.

The application is for a site located next to a 100-year floodplain which has significant slopes. The Largo-Lottsford master plan (pp. 53–54) contains detailed environmental protection guidelines for stormwater management and the protection of sensitive natural features. Again, the applicant should refer to the Environmental Planning Section referral for conformance with the Environmental chapter of the master plan and the 2005 *Approved Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan*.

Comment: The Environmental Planning Section’s referral can be found below.
 - b. **Transportation Planning Section:** The Transportation Planning Section provided an analysis of the subject application regarding transportation-related conditions from the previous approvals and provided the following conclusion.

From the standpoint of transportation, it is determined that this plan is acceptable and meets the findings required for a detailed site plan as described in Section 27-285 of the Zoning Ordinance. In consideration of all materials in this memorandum, Transportation Planning staff finds that the subject property complies with the necessary findings for a detailed site plan as those findings may relate to transportation.

- c. **Subdivision Review Section:** The Subdivision Review Section provided an analysis of the conditions of approval of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-95122 that are applicable to the subject detailed site plan. The Subdivision planner's applicable comments are discussed in Finding 9 above.

The Subdivision Section also provided an analysis of the plat notes as follows:

The recorded plat contains seven notes and they should be on the general notes of this detailed site plan where appropriate. The following plat notes in **bold** relate to the review of this detailed site plan:

1. **Lots are subject to variances approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals: No. V-239-95 for lots 49, 50& 51 and V-11-46 for lots 48 &52.**

Comment: A variance was requested from Section 27-471(h) and Section 27-474(d) of the Zoning Ordinance for Lots 50 and 51, and from Section 27-466.01 for Lot 49. The variances were approved for 68 feet and 114 feet from the street frontage requirement for Lots 50 and 51 and a waiver of direct vehicular access to a street for Lot 49. The variance and variation were approved with the preliminary plan by the Planning Board.

A note on the certificate for V-239-95 states that pursuant to Section 27-233(a):

“A decision of the Board, permitting the erection of a building, or structure shall not be valid for more than two (2) years, unless a building permit for the erection is obtained within this period and the construction is started and proceeds to completion in accordance with the terms of the decision and the permit.”

The variance (V-239-95) for lot 51 is in regard to the street frontage requirement of the lot and not for the erection of a building or structure. Therefore, the two-year validation period is not applicable for this variance. The variance is still valid and was vested with the record plat.

3. **Pursuant to Section 24-128 (b)(9) each owner grants and conveys to all other owners a non-exclusive, irrevocable easement for the passage and parking of vehicles over and across parking and driveway areas within each individual lot 48, 49, 50, 51, & 52.**

Comment: The irrevocable easement for passage and parking of vehicles, pursuant to Section 24-128 (b)(9), should be referred to in the general notes of the detailed site plan.

4. **Development is subject to restrictions/limitations established by Prince George's County Planning Board Resolution No. 96-22 (4-92155).**

Comment: Staff has reviewed Planning Board Resolution No. 96-22 for the approval of the preliminary plan; see comments in Finding 9 above.

5. **Development of this property must conform to the I-3 Conceptual Site Plan CSP-80034 approved on June 26, 1980, or as amended by any subsequent revisions thereto.**

Comment: Conformance with Conceptual Site Plan CSP-80034 was reviewed by the Urban Design Section and is discussed in Finding 8 above.

- 6. Approval of this plat is based upon a reasonable expectation that public water & sewer service will be available when needed and is conditioned on fulfilling all of the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission authorization #96-05-0040 commitments.**

Comment: The site plan does show the proposed water and sewer lines. Further review of the public water and sewer service will be performed by Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC).

- 7. Conservation area is described by limits as shown on this plat and precludes any disturbance or any installation of any structure within said area without prior written consent from the M-NCPPC planning director or designee. The removal of any dead material (i.e. branches, limbs, trunks) is allowed.**

Comment: The site plan does show the conservation easement as indicated on the record plat. It appears on the site plan that the development will not impact the conservation easement. Further review of the impact of the development on the conservation easement is examined by the Environmental Planning Section and discussed in Finding 9 above.

- d. **Trails:** At the time of the writing of the staff report, comments have not been received from the Trails Section.
- e. **Permit Review Section:** The Permit Review Section offered several comments, which are either not applicable at this time, have been addressed through revisions to the plans, or are addressed through proposed conditions of approval of this detailed site plan.
- f. **Environmental Planning:** The Environmental Planning Section indicated that a signed Natural Resources Inventory, NRI-020-09, was submitted and the detailed site plan shows the environmental features in conformance with the NRI. A Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/010/10, was reviewed and found to be in conformance. However, a detail should be added to the plan for the split-rail fence or equivalent, showing required woodland-conservation signage posted on the fencing.

Comment: The applicable comment has been included in the recommendation section of this report as a condition, prior to signature approval of this site plan.

- g. **Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department:** At the time of the writing of the staff report, comments have not been received from the Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department.
- h. **Department of Public Works & Transportation (DPW&T):** DPW&T indicated that they have no objection to VD-09021, but that the submitted plans have to be revised to show all existing islands and turning lanes on Lottsford Road and Lottsford Court.

Comment: The applicable comment has been addressed through revisions to the plan.

- i. **Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC):** WSSC indicated that comments were not provided because the review fee was not paid.

- j. **Potomac Electric Power Company (PEPCO):** At the time of the writing of the staff report, comments have not been received from PEPCO.
 - k. **City of Glenarden:** At the time of the writing of the staff report, comments have not been received from the City of Glenarden.
13. A letter dated April 6, 2010 was received from Inglewood Restaurant Park Association, Inc. stating that a private association agreement does not allow a hotel use on Lot 51, unless it is combined with Lot 52, which is not part of this application.
 14. 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.

RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the foregoing evaluation and analysis, the Urban Design staff recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and APPROVE Detailed Site Plan DSP-09021, Variance Request VD-09021, Alternative Compliance AC-10011, and Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPH/010/10 for Inglewood business Park, Largo Fairfield Inn Hotel, with the following conditions:

1. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, the applicant shall:
 - a. Provide evidence from DPW&T that approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan 24888-2009 has been revised to reflect the layout shown on the detailed site plan.
 - b. Revise General Note 15 to reflect the correct proposed building area of 55,238 square feet.
 - c. Provide a general note that states, "Lot 51 is subject to Variance No. V-239-95 as approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals."
 - d. Provide a general note that states, "Pursuant to Section 24-128(b)(9), each owner grants and conveys to all other owners a nonexclusive, irrevocable easement for the passage and parking of vehicles over and across parking and driveway areas within each individual Lot 48, 49, 50, 51, and 52."
 - e. Provide a general note that states, "Per Section 27-471(f)(2) and Planning Board approval, a maximum of 40 percent of any parking lot and no loading space shall be located in the yard to which the building's main entrance is oriented."
 - f. Remove General Note 32 from Sheet 1 that states, "Proposed hotel space square footage is approximate. See architectural drawings for exact dimensions and areas."
 - g. Revise General Note 17 to list the approved variances and correct provided setbacks to match the dimensions shown on the site plan, Sheet 5.

- h. Revise the site plan to show dimensions from the property line to the parking lot and the retaining wall on the southeastern and southern edges.
 - i. Revise the overall site plan so that all notes regarding details shall correctly refer to the appropriate sheet numbers.
 - j. Add labels and details for the proposed crosswalk to Lot 50.
 - k. Provide a detail of a railing to be used at the top of the proposed retaining wall where required.
 - l. Revise the architectural elevations to provide dimensions for all building signs.
 - m. Either obtain approval for a departure from sign design standards from Section 27-613(b)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance for the proposed building signs and from Section 27-614(c)(4) for the proposed freestanding sign, or remove the proposed signs from the detailed site plan and architectural elevations.
 - n. Revise architectural elevations to eliminate the building-mounted sign on the north side of the building facing MD 202.
 - o. Revise the architecture to remove EIFS from the ground level of the building on all elevations and replace with brick veneer.
 - p. Provide additional landscaping between the building and the surrounding parking areas to include, but not be limited to, shade trees, ornamental trees, evergreen shrubs, and annual and/or perennial planting beds.
 - q. Revise the landscape plan as follows:
 - (1) The 4.3.b. Parking Lot Perimeter Landscape Strip schedule on Sheet 15 of 15 of the site plan shall be revised to indicate the length and width of the landscaping area being provided within the parking lot islands and shall clearly indicate dimensions on Sheet 14.
 - (2) The 4.3.b. Parking Lot Perimeter Landscape Strip schedule on Sheet 15 of 15 of the site plan shall be revised to remove the five ornamental trees from the list of plants provided, as these are not located between the parking lot and property line, and therefore, should not count toward fulfilling this requirement.
 - (3) The plan on Sheet 14 of 15 of the site plan shall be revised to show the proposed tree line and to provide a dimension of the minimum landscaped yard provided along the southern property line for the “B” bufferyard.
2. Prior to the certification of the detailed site plan, the TCPII shall be revised to add a detail for a split-rail fence or equivalent, showing woodland-conservation signage posted on the fencing.