The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission
Prince George's County Planning Department
Development Review Division
301-952-3530

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

Detailed Site Plan DSP-12034

Application	**General Data**	
Project Name: Keane Enterprises, Inc.	Planning Board Hearing Date:	04/11/13
	Staff Report Date:	04/01/13
Location: Northeast corner of the intersection of Baltimore Avenue (US 1) and Berwyn House Road.	Date Accepted:	01/09/13
	Planning Board Action Limit:	Waived
	Plan Acreage:	2.86
Applicant/Address: Keane Enterprises, Inc. 44095 Pipeline Plaza, Suite 210 Ashburn, VA 20147	Zone:	M-U-I/R-55/D-D-O
	Dwelling Units:	N/A
	Gross Floor Area:	107,523 sq. ft.
	Planning Area:	66
	Tier:	Developed
	Council District:	03
	Election District	21
	Municipality:	College Park
	200-Scale Base Map:	210NE04

Purpose of Application	**Notice Dates**	
Mixed-use development with a 156-room hotel, 23,615 square feet of retail, and a parking garage.	Informational Mailing:	09/28/12
	Acceptance Mailing:	01/07/13
	Sign Posting Deadline:	03/12/13

Staff Recommendation			**Staff Reviewer:** Jill Kosack **Phone Number:** 301-952-4689 **E-mail:** Jill.Kosack@ppd.mncppc.org
APPROVAL	**APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS**	**DISAPPROVAL**	**DISCUSSION**
	X		

SITE VICINITY MAP
Legend
Site Boundary
Property
Building
Bridge
Pavement
Railroad Line
0
1,400
Feet
1 inch = 700 feet
The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission
Prince George's County Planning Department
Geographic Information System
Created: November 20, 2012
METZEROTT RD
BRANCHVILLE RD
PAINT BRANCH DR
BALTIMORE AV
49TH AV
TECUMSEH ST
QUEBEC ST
BERWYN RD
REGENTS DR
49TH AV
BERWYN HOUSE RD
POTOMAC AV
STADIUM DR
LAKELAND RD
54TH AV
51ST AV
CAMPUS DR
BALTIMORE AV

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL
PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Detailed Site Plan DSP-12034
Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan TCP2-002-13
Keane Enterprises, Inc.

The Urban Design staff has reviewed the detailed site plan 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 CRITERIA

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

a. Compliance with the requirements of the Development District Overlay (D-D-O) Zone.

b. Compliance with the requirements of the 2010 *Approved Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment.*

c. Compliance with the requirements of the Mixed Use–Infill (M-U-I) Zone.

d. The requirements of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual.*

e. The requirements of the Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance.

f. The requirements of the Prince George's County Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance.

g. Referral comments.

FINDINGS

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

1. **Request:** The detailed site plan (DSP) is for the redevelopment of the Koons Ford site, currently occupied by two single-story structures, with three buildings, including a 156-room hotel, 23,615 square feet of retail space, and the associated three-story parking garage.

2. **Development Data Summary:**

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone(s)	M-U-I/R-55/D-D-O	M-U-I/D-D-O
Use(s)	Retail	Hotel/Retail
Acreage	2.86	3.13
Lots	31	1
Square Footage/GFA	17,976	107,523

OTHER DEVELOPMENT DATA

Parking Requirements per the Sector Plan

Uses	**Spaces Required**
Lodging Use (156 rooms @ 1 space per 2 rooms)	78
Retail Use (23,615 sq. ft. @ 3 spaces per 1,000 sq. ft.)	71
Total	149*

Total Parking Provided 293**

275 standard @ 8.5 feet x 18 feet***
11 compact @ 8 feet x 18 feet
5 handicapped
2 van-accessible handicapped

Bicycle Spaces per the Sector Plan

Required (1 space per 3 parking spaces) **98**
Provided **54****

***Note:** Mixed-use developments may use the shared parking factor to determine a reduction in the required number of parking spaces; however, the applicant has chosen not to use it in this application.

****Note:** The number of parking spaces and bicycle spaces provided requires an amendment to the D-D-O standards as discussed in Finding 7 below.

Loading Spaces (per Section 27-546.18(b)*** of the Zoning Ordinance):
Retail/Lodging 1 space (interior)

***Note:** The applicable D-D-O does not have a standard for required loading spaces or parking space size. Therefore, per the M-U-I regulations, when a mix of residential and commercial uses is proposed on a single parcel, the site plan shall set out the regulations to be followed. The subject site plan proposes one loading space, internal to the building. No height for the loading space access door was provided. Therefore, a condition has been included in the approval of this DSP requiring a label of the height of all loading space access doors as at least 15 feet.

3. **Location:** The subject site is located in Planning Area 66, Council District 3, and the Developed Tier. More specifically, the site is located in the northeastern corner of the intersection of

Baltimore Avenue (US 1) and Berwyn House Road, in College Park. The site is zoned Mixed Use–Infill (M-U-I) and One-Family Detached Residential (R-55) and is subject to the Development District Overlay (D-D-O) Zone standards found in the 2010 *Approved Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment.*

4. **Surrounding Uses:** The subject property is bounded to the north by the right-of-way of Pontiac Street with commercial uses in the M-U-I Zone beyond; to the east by single-family detached homes in the R-55 Zone; to the south by the right-of-way of Osage Street and Berwyn House Road, with commercial uses in the M-U-I Zone beyond; and to the west by the right-of-way of Baltimore Avenue (US 1), with commercial uses in the M-U-I Zone beyond.

5. **Previous Approvals:** Lots 6 through 26, 29 through 37, and Parcel 121 were recorded in Plat Book BDS 1-30 on July 6, 1906. The property is improved with a 14,434-square-foot building and a 3,542-square-foot building, which were both built prior to 1965. The applicant is not required to file a preliminary plan of subdivision for this property as discussed in Finding 12e below. The subject property has an approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan, 23848-2012.

6. **Design Features:** The subject property is roughly rectangular in shape and is surrounded on three sides by public rights-of-way: Baltimore Avenue (US 1) to the west, Berwyn House Road and Osage Street to the south, and Pontiac Street to the north, and adjacent to the east are single-family detached properties. The DSP proposes to develop the property with three separate buildings. A one-story, 30.67-foot-high, 12,302-square-foot retail building (Building 2, proposed to house a CVS Pharmacy) is located in the southwestern corner of the site, closest to the intersection of US 1 and Berwyn House Road. A six-story, 71.33-foot-high, 95,221-square-foot, mixed-use, hotel and retail building (Building 1) fills the remaining frontage along US 1, to the northeastern corner of the site, nearest the intersection of US 1 and Pontiac Street. The site's only access drive is to the east of the two main buildings and bisects the development, running from Pontiac Street through to Berwyn House Road. A separate three-level parking garage is located to the east of the access drive, with entrances off of the access drive and Pontiac Street. The full three levels of the parking garage will be above-grade along the western and southern elevations; however, only one to two levels will be above-grade along the northern and eastern elevations, as there is an existing hill at the eastern end of the site. The eastern edge of the property, for more than 70 feet, is to remain undeveloped and undisturbed as a woodland preservation area.

   The proposed buildings are located with full building frontages provided within approximately 18 feet of the US 1 right-of-way for almost the entirety of the site's frontage. However, they also sit approximately three to four feet above the elevation of the sidewalk along US 1 in order to raise the building out of the existing floodplain on-site. The elevation change is accommodated with a highly designed arrangement of concrete stairs and planters. Handicapped ramps at the northern and southern ends of the frontage provide accessibility to the buildings. A pedestrian promenade, located between Buildings 1 and 2, provides access from the US 1 frontage through to the parking garage. The site design uses micro-bioretention areas at the northern and southern ends of the parking garage, along with numerous, small planter boxes throughout the site for stormwater management. Benches, bike racks, and pedestrian-scaled lighting round out the list of provided pedestrian amenities.

   In regard to architecture, Building 1 (the hotel and retail building) is proposed to be faced in a red-brown brick veneer on all levels and elevations, with various horizontal trim pieces made from cast stone. The lowest elevation facing US 1 and Pontiac Street has multiple storefront windows and doors, including some colored fabric or metal awnings and black granite bases. The

upper levels include multiple full-height windows with metal bases, as is typical in hotel buildings. At the top of this building, in the northwestern corner, is a "landmark tower" feature consisting of a taller, open-air area framed with brick columns and cap. The rear or eastern elevation facing the parking garage has only one public access door, but multiple full-height windows on the lower level which offer views into the general hotel facilities. The entrance to the one internal loading/trash area is located along the eastern façade of this building, in the southern corner, behind an overhead door.

The one-story retail building, Building 2, is proposed to be faced in a pattern of orange, rough and smooth brick veneer with the main entrance at the southwest corner, facing the intersection of US 1 and Berwyn House Road. Storefront windows with metal trim fill the majority of the US 1 building façade, but the majority of the Berwyn House Road and eastern elevations consists of brick walls with clerestory windows, except for where there is a bank of windows at the store entrance facing the parking garage along the eastern elevation. The façades of Buildings 1 and 2 that face each other, with the pedestrian promenade in between, are rather plain, but have green screens and poster boxes to enhance the pedestrian experience. The parking garage is a rather standard design with precast concrete panels on the lower half of each of the three levels, and open air on the upper half. Some vertical precast concrete pieces break-up the linear expanses, along with the two elevator/stairwell banks along the western façade facing the hotel building, which are faced in a red-brown brick and extend higher than the surrounding three levels.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **The 2010 Approved Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment and the standards of the Development District Overlay (D-D-O) Zone:** The 2010 *Approved Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and SMA) defines long-range land use and development policies, detailed zoning changes, design standards, and a Development District Overlay (D-D-O) Zone for the US 1 Corridor area. The land use concept of the sector plan divides the corridor into four inter-related areas, walkable nodes, corridor infill, existing neighborhoods, and natural areas, for the purpose of examining issues and opportunities and formulating recommendations. Detailed recommendations are provided for six distinct areas within the sector plan: Downtown College Park, University of Maryland, Midtown, Uptown, Autoville and Cherry Hill Road, and the Hollywood Commercial District. The overall vision for the Central US 1 Corridor is a vibrant hub of activity highlighted by walkable concentrations of pedestrian- and transit-oriented mixed-use development, the integration of the natural and built environments, extensive use of sustainable design techniques, thriving residential communities, a complete and balanced transportation network, and a world-class educational institution.

The sector plan recommends three land uses across the subject property: mixed-use commercial land uses along the US 1 frontage, commercial land uses as a transition toward the residential land uses to the east, and parks and open space on the existing wooded portion of the property along the eastern edge (see Map 8 on page 60). These land uses are described on page 57 of the sector plan.

Mixed-use commercial land uses are "Properties that contain a mix of uses that are predominantly nonresidential on the ground floor, including commerce, office, institutional, civic, and recreational uses. These properties may include a residential component, but are primarily commercial in nature." Commercial land uses emphasize commerce, office, and wholesale services and include associated yards and parking areas. Parks and open space land uses include

parks, recreation areas, golf courses, and cemeteries. The proposed development of a hotel and retail space is consistent with both the mixed-use commercial and commercial land uses, and the applicant's intent to retain existing woodland would preserve existing land that could be used for passive open space on the eastern end of the site. This DSP application is in conformance with the land use recommendations of the sector plan.

The proposed development is located in the Lower Midtown walkable node and the corridor infill character area as shown on Map 8 on page 60 of the sector plan. Walkable nodes are intended to be hubs of pedestrian and transit activity emphasizing higher density mixed-use development at appropriate locations along the Central US 1 Corridor, and should be "directly and uniquely influenced by adjacent neighborhoods. Building height, scale, and type will be tailored to the existing businesses and residents, while accommodating desired growth and change." (page 42) Walkable node development should consist of buildings between two and six stories in height (pages 65 and 234).

The corridor infill character area consists of mixed use, but primarily residential development with park-like landscaping and easy accessibility to goods and services, and is intended to facilitate the redevelopment of existing strip-commercial development along US 1 while serving as a transition from the more intensive walkable nodes to existing residential areas adjacent to the corridor. The proposed parking structure and preserved wooded area are located within the corridor infill portion of the subject property, serving as a transition in intensity and use from the walkable node to the existing residential neighborhood east of the subject property.

The proposed rezoning of the R-55 portion of the subject property to the M-U-I Zone is intended to facilitate the development of the property with the proposed mix of hotel and retail uses. The M-U-I Zone would permit this development and the associated parking structure, while streamlining review procedures, and the retention of the existing wooded area on the east side of the subject property will ensure a transition in density and intensity to protect the existing residential area to the east. There are no master plan issues pertaining to the proposed rezoning.

Requests to Amend Development District Standards
The submitted application and justification materials indicate the need to deviate from a number of development district standards to accommodate the proposed development on the subject property. These standards are discussed as follows (all page numbers reference the sector plan):

Building Form: Build-to Line—The applicant requests an 18-foot build-to-line (BTL) from US 1, instead of the required BTL of zero feet as indicated on pages 228 and 230 for mandatory shop frontages within walkable nodes and the maximum front BTL principal of ten feet, per page 234. The justification for this additional setback is linked to floodplain mitigation. The applicant has provided materials that indicate a change to the floodplain as a result of nearby development on the west side of US 1 and recent draft updates to the floodplain by FEMA (The Federal Emergency Management Agency). There are no significant issues with this amendment request and, in fact, setting the building somewhat further back from US 1 could help facilitate the potential for future cycle tracks along the right-of-way, in keeping with the transportation recommendations of the sector plan. Staff recommends that the Planning Board approve this amendment request.

Building Form: Height—The main hotel building, Building 1, conforms to the development district standards as a six-story building. However, the proposed stand-alone pharmacy building, Building 2, is one story in height. The applicant has requested an amendment from the development district standards to allow for a one-story building, instead of the two stories otherwise required as the minimum height per the standard on page 234.

Building height has a strong correlation to walkability and sense of place. While the stand-alone pharmacy building may have the height of a two-story building, the building façades should be redesigned to reflect a two-story appearance to better conform to the development district standards and reinforce the sense of enclosure and pedestrian scale that the sector plan strives to achieve. With a revision to the design of the façades on Building 2 to portray a two-story appearance, staff recommends that the Planning Board approve this amendment request.

Building Form: Parking—The applicant requests an amendment to the parking standards "to provide sufficient parking for proposed uses to ensure, among other things, that employees do not park in the residential areas." Staff notes the applicant has used the parking factors for corridor infill areas rather than walkable node areas. The applicant has also included the shared parking factor in the DSP parking schedule, which is intended to provide additional parking reductions for mixed-use development.

The following table outlines the parking that is required within the Central US 1 Corridor D-D-O Zone:

Use	Walkable Node Requirement	Total	Corridor Infill Requirement	Total
156 hotel rooms	1 space/2 bedrooms	78	1 space/2 bedrooms	78
23,615 sq. ft. retail space	2 spaces/1,000 sq. ft.	48	3 spaces/1,000 sq. ft.	71
SUBTOTAL	N/A	126	N/A	149
Shared Parking Factor	N/A	Divide by 1.3	N/A	Divide by 1.3
TOTAL	N/A	97	N/A	115

Since the applicant is proposing a significant increase in the number of parking spaces required by the D-D-O Zone for development in the walkable node (from the 126 spaces required in the walkable node to 293 total spaces as indicated on the DSP), it does not make sense to use the shared parking factor, which is an optional reduction method and not a D-D-O Zone requirement for all development. General Note 7D on the submitted site plans should be revised to delete the shared parking factor calculation and the baseline assumptions for the parking calculations should be revised to the walkable node requirements.

The provision of a structured parking facility behind the main building, largely masked from view along US 1, helps support the requested amendment for increasing the site's proposed parking. All of the additional spaces would be provided within the parking structure and would have minimal negative impact on the design quality and building form for the proposed development. Staff recommends that the Planning Board approve this amendment request.

Building Form: Bicycle Parking—The applicant requests an amendment to the required number of bicycle parking spaces, which is one bicycle parking space for every three vehicle parking spaces, or 98 bicycle parking spaces for the requested 293 vehicle parking spaces. The applicant

proposes to provide 54 total bicycle spaces with 42 spaces in the parking structure and 4 each along US 1, Berwyn House Road, and internal to the site.

Staff finds this request to be reasonable given the primary hotel use on the site is unlikely to attract significant bicycle traffic. The applicant has been requested to consider bike sharing and participation in the City of College Park and University of Maryland's joint bike sharing program and staff supports this participation. With the addition of a bike share station, staff recommends that the Planning Board approve this amendment request.

Architectural Elements: Brick Detailing—The applicant requests amendments to the header and sill standards on page 252 to provide headers and sills at the same widths as the associated windows, whereas the D-D-O Zone calls for headers and sills to be slightly wider than the openings they span. Staff notes these particular development district standards are "should" statements and, therefore, constitute guidelines rather than stringent standards and that amendments to these standards are unnecessary.

Architectural Elements: Signage—The applicant requests amendments to the signage standards of the D-D-O Zone to provide four small way-finding signs and for signs mounted perpendicular to the façade to be greater than nine square feet with a proposed maximum size of 36 square feet. The development district standards prohibit freestanding signs and specifically reference pole-mounted signs on page 255 as a type of signage that is not permitted. Community Planning staff recommended that the applicant should be encouraged to mount directional signage, such as parking blade indicators to the front and side façades of the proposed buildings, in lieu of freestanding signs. However, given the increased building setback along US 1 and the blocked view to the parking garage, staff believes that small, freestanding, way-finding signs, as shown on the DSP, would be helpful to prevent confusion regarding vehicular access to the uses on-site. Therefore, staff recommends that the Planning Board approve this amendment request.

With regard to the requested amendment to increase the maximum square footage of signs mounted perpendicular to the building from 9 to 36 square feet, the scale of the signs in relation to the placement and size of the buildings is of utmost importance in determining the appropriateness of the request. The proposed signage locations and proportions indicated on the architectural elevations suggest that the scale of these signs will remain appropriate for their intended use. Therefore, staff recommends that the Planning Board approve this amendment request.

Sustainability and the Environment—The applicant requests an amendment to the D-D-O Zone requirement for all development in the walkable nodes to obtain LEED Silver (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) or better certification. The sector plan contains six primary vision statements that are intended to guide new development and the revitalization of the corridor. Vision 4 emphasizes sustainable urbanism and the celebration of natural resources, highlighting the symbiotic relationship of the natural and built environments. The sector plan strives for the highest quality of environmentally-sensitive infrastructure and development, and the development district standards require LEED Silver or better certification in the walkable nodes to meet this goal and implement the vision of the sector plan.

Amendments from this crucial plan implementation standard are not recommended; however, staff recognizes that LEED certification is impossible to obtain prior to building construction and, in some cases, initial operation, and recommends a condition of approval that requires LEED Silver or better certification prior to issuance of the first use and occupancy permit for the proposed development. Therefore, staff recommends the Planning Board disapprove the requested amendment regarding LEED certification.

The applicant also requests amendments to the development district standards regarding passive solar and ventilation design and on-site energy generation and efficiency. Staff notes that the identified standards are considered to be guidelines and that amendment from these specific standards are unnecessary.

Finally, the applicant requests amendments to standards pertaining to water efficiency and recharge and stormwater management and the Paint Branch Stream Valley. The Paint Branch stream is an extremely sensitive environmental feature with noted flooding and erosion issues as identified in the sector plan. The standards established on page 257 are intended to ensure the protection of Paint Branch. The applicant conforms to most of the standards, but requests amendments from the requirements for underground or above-grade cisterns to be integrated within new development to reduce the amount of stormwater flowing into Paint Branch, to store water on-site for uses such as landscape irrigation, and the standard to use pervious materials for at-grade walks and pathways.

Staff notes that the project has received conceptual approval for its proposed stormwater management plans by the Maryland Department of the Environment. In light of this approval, staff can support these amendments, but recommends the applicant continue to explore the use of cisterns or other water retention systems and the use of pervious pavement, and notes that these features can contribute to LEED scoring while benefiting the site, adjacent properties, and Paint Branch. Therefore, staff recommends that the Planning Board approve these amendment requests.

8. **Zoning Ordinance:** The DSP application has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements of the M-U-I Zone, Airport Compatibility, Part 10B, and the requirements of the Development District Overlay (D-D-O) Zone of the Zoning Ordinance:

a. Section 27-546.16, Approval of the M-U-I Zone, of the Zoning Ordinance allows for property in the D-D-O Zone to be reclassified to the M-U-I Zone through the property owner application process in Section 27-548.26(b). This section specifies that the owner shall show, with a DSP, that the proposed development conforms with the purposes and recommendations for the development district, as stated in the master plan, master plan amendment, or sector plan, and that the case be reviewed by the District Council. A discussion of the subject DSP's conformance with the applicable sector plan is in Finding 7 above. Based on this extensive discussion, staff recommends that the Planning Board find that the proposed development conforms with the purposes and recommendations for the development district, as stated in the sector plan. The Planning Board's final recommendation on the subject DSP will be forwarded to the District Council for review as required.

b. Section 27-546.19(c), Site Plans for Mixed Uses, of the Zoning Ordinance requires that:

(c) A Detailed Site Plan may not be approved unless the owner shows:

1. The site plan meets all approval requirements in Part 3, Division 9;

2. All proposed uses meet applicable development standards approved with the Master Plan, Sector Plan, Transit District Development Plan, or other applicable plan;

Comment: The site plan does not meet all site design guidelines and development district standards of the Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and SMA as discussed in Finding 7 above.

3. Proposed uses on the property will be compatible with one another;

4. Proposed uses will be compatible with existing or approved future development on adjacent properties and an applicable Transit or Development District; and

Comment: The application proposes a mixture of a hotel and commercial/retail uses in a vertical and horizontal mixed-use format in two buildings fronting on Baltimore Avenue (US 1), with the commercial/retail spaces fronting US 1. The proposed uses on the subject property will be compatible with each other and will be compatible with existing or approved future development on adjacent properties due to the large setback and grade difference between this proposed development and the adjacent properties to the east.

5. Compatibility standards and practices set forth below will be followed, or the owner shows why they should not be applied:

(A) Proposed buildings should be compatible in size, height, and massing to buildings on adjacent properties;

Comment: The subject site's only adjacent properties lie to the east, are outside of the D-D-O Zone, are zoned R-55, and are currently developed with two-story, single-family, detached residential buildings. The closest building on the proposed development, the three-level parking garage, is set back over 70 feet from the eastern property line, with existing trees to be preserved in a conservation easement in between it and the property line. The garage is also built into the existing hillside such that it appears as only a one-story building when viewed from the majority of the adjacent properties to the east. This site design will mitigate the proposed buildings so as to make them compatible in size, height, and massing with the buildings on the adjacent property.

(B) Primary façades and entries should face adjacent streets or public walkways and be connected by on-site walkways, so pedestrians may avoid crossing parking lots and driveways;

Comment: The proposed hotel and retail buildings feature main entries along US 1, the primary adjacent street, and along the eastern elevations facing the proposed parking garage. Sidewalks surround the hotel and retail buildings completely to provide full, unobstructed pedestrian connectivity.

(C) Site design should minimize glare, light, and other visual intrusions into and impacts on yards, open areas, and building façades on adjacent properties;

Comment: The site plan provides labels for proposed pedestrian street lights, building-mounted, and other lighting on-site along with a photometric plan. This plan indicates that the lighting design minimizes glare, light and visual intrusions onto the few nearby yards, open areas, and building façades.

(D) Building materials and color should be similar to materials and color on adjacent properties and in the surrounding neighborhoods, or building design should incorporate scaling, architectural detailing, or similar techniques to enhance compatibility;

Comment: The main proposed building materials for the retail and hotel buildings include an orange rough or smooth brick veneer and a red/brown brick veneer, with details in cast stone and black granite. The parking garage will be mainly faced in precast concrete. Storefront aluminum windows with grey or brown metal trim complete the major façade elements. These building materials and colors are similar to other mixed-use developments in the surrounding neighborhood.

(E) Outdoor storage areas and mechanical equipment should be located and screened to minimize visibility from adjacent properties and public streets;

Comment: The DSP does not propose any outdoor storage areas and all of the proposed mechanical equipment will be internal or located on the roof. Therefore, these areas will have minimum visibility from adjacent properties and public streets.

(F) Signs should conform to applicable Development District Standards or to those in Part 12, unless the owner shows that its proposed signage program meets goals and objectives in applicable plans; and

Comment: The submitted architecture provides some basic details regarding the proposed building-mounted and freestanding signage on-site. The DSP does request some amendments to the applicable development district standards for the signs as discussed in Finding 7 above.

(G) The owner or operator should minimize adverse impacts on adjacent properties and the surrounding neighborhood by appropriate setting of:

(i) Hours of operation or deliveries;

Comment: The applicant did not indicate the proposed hours of

deliveries for the hotel and retail uses on-site. However, the one proposed loading space is located completely internal to the site, literally in the center of the site, surrounded and enclosed by buildings, which will minimize the adverse impacts on the adjacent properties and surrounding neighborhood.

(ii) Location of activities with potential adverse impacts;

Comment: No activities with potential adverse impacts are proposed on-site, except for the loading and trash facilities, which are located internally to the building.

(iii) Location and use of trash receptacles;

Comment: Proposed trash receptacles are located internal to the building, behind a vehicle access door. As long as this door remains closed when the trash area is not being accessed, this area should have no adverse impact on adjacent properties. To ensure this, a note should be added to the DSP that all vehicular access doors shall remain closed except during times of entrance and exiting of vehicles.

(iv) Location of loading and delivery spaces;

Comment: One loading and delivery space is provided internal to the building, screened by vehicle access doors. As long as these doors remain closed when the loading spaces are not being accessed, this area should have no adverse impact on adjacent properties. To ensure this, a note should be added to any approval of this DSP that all vehicular access doors shall remain closed except during times of entrance and exiting of vehicles.

(v) Light intensity and hours of illumination; and

Comment: The site plan provides a photometric plan for the lighting on-site confirming there are minimal adverse impacts on adjacent properties and the surrounding neighborhood.

(vi) Location and use of outdoor vending machines.

Comment: The subject DSP does not propose any outdoor vending machines.

c. The subject application is located within Aviation Policy Area (APA) 6 under the traffic pattern for the small general aviation College Park Airport. The DSP should be revised to note this on the coversheet. The applicable regulations regarding APA-6 are discussed as follows:

Section 27-548.42. Height requirements

(a) Except as necessary and incidental to airport operations, no building,

structure, or natural feature shall be constructed, altered, maintained, or allowed to grow so as to project or otherwise penetrate the airspace surfaces defined by Federal Aviation Regulation Part 77 or the Code of Maryland, COMAR 11.03.05, Obstruction of Air Navigation.

(b) In APA-4 and APA-6, no building permit may be approved for a structure higher than fifty (50) feet unless the applicant demonstrates compliance with FAR Part 77.

Comment: The subject application proposes a six-story building with a maximum height of 71.33 feet. The proposed building height is inconsistent with the building height restriction of APA-6. Prior to certification of the DSP, the applicant shall provide proof of compliance with Federal Aviation Regulation (FAR) Part 77.

d. Section 27-548.25(b) of the Zoning Ordinance requires that the Planning Board find that the site plan meets applicable development district standards in order to approve a detailed site plan. As discussed in Finding 7 above, this DSP requests multiple amendments to applicable D-D-O Zone standards. Staff believes that the requested amendments to development standards would benefit the development district and would not substantially impair implementation of the Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and SMA.

9. **The Prince George's County Landscape Manual:** The approved Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and SMA states that Section 4.2, 4.3, and 4.7 of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* (Landscape Manual) do not apply within the applicable development district. Therefore, the proposed development is only subject to the requirements of Sections 4.4, 4.5, and 4.9 of the Landscape Manual. Staff has reviewed the submitted plans against the requirements of these sections and found them to be in conformance.

10. **Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance:** In comments dated March 20, 2013, the Environmental Planning Section stated that the property under discussion is subject to the environmental regulations of Subtitle 27 of the Prince George's County Code that came into effect on September 1, 2010 because there are no previously approved development plans. The project is subject to the Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance (WCO) effective September 1, 2010, because there are no previous tree conservation plan approvals.

This property is subject to the provisions of the WCO because the gross tract area is in excess of 40,000 square feet in size and it contains more than 10,000 square feet of existing woodland. A Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan, TCP2-002-13, has been submitted. The site has a woodland conservation threshold of 0.34 acre and proposes to meet the requirement with 0.44 acre of on-site woodland preservation. The woodland conservation worksheet shows 0.44 acre of woodlands preserved and the TCP2 plan view states 0.46 acre of woodlands to be preserved. This discrepancy should be corrected prior to signature approval.

Section 25-122(b)(1)(G) of the WCO requires that "Specimen trees, champion trees, and trees that are part of a historic site or are associated with a historic structure shall be preserved and the design shall either preserve the critical root zone of each tree in its entirety or preserve an appropriate percentage of the critical root zone in keeping with the tree's condition and the species' ability to survive construction as provided in the Technical Manual."

Effective October 1, 2009, the State Forest Conservation Act was amended to include a requirement for a variance if a specimen, champion, or historic tree is proposed to be removed. This state requirement was incorporated in the adopted County Code effective on September 1, 2010.

A Subtitle 25 Variance application, a statement of justification in support of a variance, and a tree removal plan were stamped as received on February 18, 2013.

The specimen tree table on the TCP2 shows the removal of one specimen tree. The limits of disturbance on the plan also show that this tree is to be removed.

Section 25-119(d)(1) of the WCO contains six required findings to be made before a variance can be granted, as discussed below. The submitted letter of justification seeks to address the required findings for the one specimen tree to be removed. Staff agrees with the approach to the analysis to remove the one specimen tree because the tree's close proximity to the existing development, existing contours, and the need for a level site prevent this tree from being saved.

(A) Special conditions peculiar to the property have caused the unwarranted hardship;

Comment: The topography on the site is such that the existing slope occupied by the specimen tree is extremely steep and must be removed in order to bring the site to a grade that is suitable for development. Preservation of the specimen tree is not feasible given the amount of cut required. The applicant is preserving a second Specimen Tree (ST-1) located on the property, as well as providing a woodland conservation area as shown on the TCP2.

(B) Enforcement of these rules will deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by others in similar areas;

Comment: Enforcement of this rule will prevent the applicant from utilizing the developable area of the proposed site. Other developed properties immediately adjacent to the site are not subject to the same topographic issues.

(C) Granting the variance will not confer on the applicant a special privilege that would be denied to other applicants;

Comment: Other developed properties immediately adjacent to the site are not subject to the same topographic issues. Therefore, granting this variance would not convey a special privilege denied to other applicants.

(D) The request is not based on conditions or circumstances which are the result of actions by the applicant;

Comment: The topographic conditions are not a result of any action by the applicant.

(E) The request does not arise from a condition relating to land or building use, either permitted or nonconforming, on a neighboring property; and

Comment: The existing topographic conditions are not related to land or building use on a neighboring property.

(F) Granting of the variance will not adversely affect water quality.

Comment: Water quality will remain unaffected and will be subject to the requirements of the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) and the Prince George's County Soil Conservation District.

The required findings of Section 25-119(d) have been adequately addressed for the removal of one Specimen Tree (ST-1).

The site contains significant environmental features that are required to be preserved and/or restored to the fullest extent possible by Section 27-285(b)(4) of the Zoning Ordinance. A significant portion of the site is located within the 100-year floodplain. This feature is included within the primary management area (PMA) on the subject property. The on-site PMA is associated with the Paint Branch stream system located west of US 1 (Baltimore Avenue).

Impacts to the regulated environmental features should be limited to those that are necessary for the development of the property. Necessary impacts are those that are directly attributable to infrastructure required for the reasonable use and orderly and efficient development of the subject property, or are those that are required by County Code for reasons of health, safety, or welfare. Necessary impacts include, but are not limited to, adequate sanitary sewerage lines and water lines, road crossings for required street connections, and outfalls for stormwater management facilities. Road crossings of streams and/or wetlands may be appropriate if placed at the location of an existing crossing or at the point of least impact to the regulated environmental features. Stormwater management outfalls may also be considered necessary impacts if the site has been designed to place the outfall at the point of least impact. The types of impacts that can be avoided include those for site grading, building placement, parking, stormwater management facilities (not including outfalls), and road crossings where reasonable alternatives exist. The cumulative impacts for the development of a property should be the fewest necessary and sufficient to reasonably develop the site in conformance with County Code.

Impacts to regulated environmental features must first be avoided and then minimized. If impacts to the regulated environmental features are proposed, a statement of justification must be submitted. A letter of justification dated February 18, 2013, stamped as received February 26, 2013, has been submitted. The applicant also provided five exhibits showing the areas within the PMA that are proposed for impacts for the entire project area. Some of the exhibits show multiple impacts of different types.

The project area is impacted by 100-year floodplain which comprises 71 percent of the site. There are existing buildings and parking areas within this floodplain which will be removed as part of the development. The DSP proposes to impact the PMA in order to construct a new mixed-use development project. This application proposes 2.17 acres of permanent PMA impacts to the 100-year floodplain.

The applicant indicates that attempts were made to avoid all impacts to the regulated environmental features of the site, but no practicable alternative could be found to achieve complete avoidance because of the amount of floodplain and the topography of the site.

According to the letter of justification, the applicant is proposing a total of approximately 2.18 acres of impacts for a garage, hotel/retail building, sidewalks, stormwater management, and landscaping/hardscape. At least one of the impacts will result in the restoration of green space currently impacted by parking. The other impacts are considered permanent; however, the

proposed stormwater management facilities will result in pervious areas that will continue to have some natural infiltration functions.

The following chart summarizes each impact as shown on Exhibit B. Applicant commentary, acreage, and staff's recommendation is also included.

Exhibit Number	Impacts	Quantity of Impact	Staff Recommendation
1	Parking Garage	0.47 acre	Supported
2	Hotel and Retail Building	0.86 acre	Supported
3	Paved entrances and surface parking and sidewalk connections to the ROW	0.31 acre	Supported
4	SWM	0.02 acre	Supported
5	Landscaping/Hardscaping	0.52 acre	Supported

Because a significant portion of the site is encumbered by floodplain, staff agrees with the applicant that there is no practical alternative to avoid or minimize the floodplain impacts. To deny the applicant's request would impose an undue hardship and render the site undevelopable.

Authorization from the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) will be required for the proposed development in the floodplain and to ensure that the design is in conformance with the Floodplain Ordinance and State regulations. Submission of the approved final stormwater management plans is acceptable in lieu of written authorization.

Based on the review of the impacts, along with discussions with the applicant, staff supports the requested impacts with conditions.

11. **Prince George's County Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance:** A ten percent tree canopy coverage requirement applies to this M-U-I-zoned site per the Prince George's County Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance. This amounts to approximately 13,560 square feet or ten percent of the subject 3.13-acre site. The subject application appears to meet the requirement through existing woodland preservation in the eastern portion of the site; however, no schedule was provided. Therefore, a condition has been included in the Recommendation section requiring this to be added prior to certification.

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

    a. **Historic—**In a memorandum dated January 11, 2013, the Historic Preservation Section stated that they reviewed the subject application and found it will have no effect on identified historic sites, resources, or districts.

    b. **Archeology—**In a memorandum dated January 18, 2013, the archeology coordinator of the Historic Preservation Section stated that a Phase I archeological survey is not recommended on the subject 2.86-acre property located at 8315 Baltimore Avenue in College Park, Maryland. The subject property is currently developed with a vacant automobile sales building and lot. A search of current and historic photographs, topographic and historic maps, and locations of currently known archeological sites indicates the probability of archeological sites within the subject property is low. This

proposal will not impact any historic sites, historic resources, documented properties, or known archeological sites.

c. **Community Planning Division—**In a memorandum dated March 26, 2013, the Community Planning Division provided an analysis of the subject DSP's conformance with the D-D-O Zone as discussed in Finding 7 above. They also provided the following additional information:

This application is consistent with the 2002 *Prince George's County Approved General Plan* Development Pattern policies for corridor nodes in the Developed Tier. This application conforms to the land use recommendations of the 2010 *Approved Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* for mixed-use commercial, commercial, and park and open space land uses in the walkable node and corridor infill character areas.

This application is located under the traffic pattern for a small general aviation airport (College Park Airport). This area is subject to Aviation Policy Area (APA) regulations adopted by County Council Bill CB-51-2002 (DR-2) as Sections 27-548.32 through 27-548.48 of the Zoning Ordinance. Specifically, the subject property is located in APA-6. The APA regulations contain additional height requirements in Section 27-548.42 and purchaser notification requirements for property sales in Section 27-548.43 that are relevant to evaluation of this application. No building permit may be approved for a structure higher than 50 feet in APA-6 unless the applicant demonstrates compliance with Federal Aviation Regulation (FAR) Part 77.

There is a discrepancy between the proposed retail square footage associated with the proposed development. In the application package and justification materials, the size is listed as 24,530 square feet while General Note 6 on the site plan indicates 23,631 square feet. The final number needs to be reconciled and listed consistently throughout the application package.

The proposed architecture of the structured parking facility should be refined to incorporate additional materials and detailing reflective of the proposed hotel building to present more attractive and unified façades visible to the public from Baltimore Avenue (US 1), Berwyn House Road, and Pontiac Street. The two stair towers are well-designed, but the remainder of the parking structure consists of unrelieved precast concrete panels and structural support elements. Additional attention to detailing and materials reflective of the associated building, as recommended on page 243 of the sector plan, would result in a more attractive and high-quality structure.

As noted elsewhere, the proposed one-story pharmacy building should be redesigned to reflect a two-story architectural elevation design. Additionally, the proposed pharmacy building should be revised so that the Berwyn House Road frontage incorporates a design more evocative of traditional storefront architecture in keeping with the development district standards for façades and storefronts on pages 245 and 246 of the sector plan. Specifically, a range of 20 to 70 percent of all façades facing a street shall contain transparent windows. The proposed architectural treatment of the southern (Berwyn House Road) façade of the pharmacy building consists of brick walls with clerestory windows and does not meet the intent or the letter of this standard.

Comment: The issues raised have been addressed through conditions of approval included in the Recommendation section of this report.

d. **Transportation—**In a memorandum dated March 18, 2013, the Transportation Planning Section offered the following:

The applicant proposes to raze the existing commercial building and its surface parking lot uses and construct a 156-room hotel, approximately 24,500 gross square feet of commercial retail uses, and a maximum of 293 parking spaces as structured parking. The maximum allowed parking by the plan is 117 spaces. This is an increase of 173 spaces over the maximum allowed number of parking spaces. The site has frontage on Baltimore Avenue (US 1), but the plan is not proposing any direct vehicular access to or from US 1. Access to the site will be limited to one access driveway from Berwyn House Road and one from Pontiac Street, both approximately 100 feet east of their intersections with US 1. Both of these roadways are two-lane, undivided facilities owned and maintained by the City of College Park.

The findings and recommendations outlined below are based upon a review of relevant and submitted material and analysis, all conducted in accordance with the requirements of the 2010 *Approved Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and SMA) and the "Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals."

With the proposed site plan, the applicant submitted on January 9, 2013 for review, a comprehensive traffic analysis dated October 24, 2012. In the submitted traffic impact study, it is reported that the proposed development of a 156-room hotel and approximately 24,500 gross square feet of commercial retail uses will generate 129 and 246 vehicle trips during the AM and PM peak hours, respectively. The AM and PM peak-hour trip totals include the recommended reduction for pass-by trips for the proposed commercial uses (60 percent).

In addition to the site's generated traffic, the traffic impact study includes the calculated annual growth of one-half of one percent per year for through traffic for US 1 through the projected buildout year 2014, and the projected 2,981 AM and 3,821 PM peak- hour traffic for all of the approved, but not yet built or occupied development applications within the study area. This study was referred to the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA), DPW&T, and the City of College Park for their review and comments.

The calculated weighted average of the critical lane volume (CLV) and level of service (LOS) under existing, background, and total traffic for the AM and PM peak periods for the US 1 Corridor between Campus Way/Paint Branch Parkway and Greenbelt Road are reported below:

Study Period	Existing Traffic CLV / LOS	Background Traffic	Total Traffic CLV / LOS
AM peak Period	953 / A	1149 / B	1168 / CA
PM peak Period	1134 / B	1408 / D	1478 / E

The minimum acceptable average CLV/LOS for any of the three corridor segments per the approved and adopted adequacy standards of the sector plan is 1600/E.

The approved sector plan contains a number of recommendations and policies for exploring the diversion of shorter vehicle trips to walking or biking trips. The walkability, complete streets, and urban design discussions of the sector plan include and identify the need for provision of safe and adequate street crossings, and pedestrian and bike accommodations at intersections throughout the study area and especially in the downtown areas.

It is important to note that the sector plan recommends the establishment of a corridor-wide Transportation Demand Management (TDM) district and a self-sustaining Transportation Management Association (TMA) to manage it. As of this writing, the US 1 TDM district has not been established.

Transportation Staff Conclusions
Based on the preceding findings, the Transportation Planning Section concludes that existing transportation facilities will be adequate, as required by the Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and SMA, to serve the proposed redevelopment of the site as shown on the submitted DSP, if the approval is conditioned on the following:

(1) Total development within the subject property shall be limited to development which generates no more than 129 AM and 246 PM peak-hour vehicle trips.

(2) Prior to the certification, the plan shall be revised to correctly reflect and dedicate to SHA the required right-of-way for the entire property frontage with US 1 per the most recent SHA planning drawings for US 1, and/or as approved by the sector plan.

(3) Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following improvements shall (1) have full financial assurance, (2) have been permitted for construction by SHA for part (a), and the City of College Park for (b), and (3) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with SHA and the City:

- The provision of any traffic signal modifications, pedestrian/ bike push buttons and count-down displays at all approaches, and inclusion of highly visible and well delineated pedestrian cross walks and stop bars on all approaches at the intersections of US 1 with Berwyn House Road per SHA and the City of College Park standards.

- The provision of wide pedestrian crosswalks on all approaches of Pontiac Street and US 1, if deemed necessary by the City of College Park.

Comment: The suggested conditions have been included in the Recommendation section of this report.

e. **Subdivision**—In a memorandum dated March 19, 2013, the Subdivision Review Section offered the following:

The site is currently split zoned and in the M-U-I and R-55 Zones, and is 3.13 acres. The subject property was recorded in Plat Book BDS 1-30 on July 6, 1906. Based on the record plat, Parcel 121 is an alley and not a parcel. The DSP should be to be revised to reflect Parcel 121 as an alley. The site is currently improved with a 14,434-square-foot building and a 3,542-square-foot building. The applicant submitted a DSP for the development of a mixed-use development with a 156-room hotel, 24,530 square feet of retail, and a parking garage.

The subject site and right-of-way were recorded in Plat Book BDS 1-30 on July 6, 1906. In accordance with the Prince George's County Code, Section 7-132, all platted rights-of-way dedicated to public use by plat after 1908 are automatically accepted without any action required on the part of the public entity within the County. Platted rights-of-way which were dedicated by plat prior to 1908 are subject to the common law rule regarding the method by which government entities may obtain public rights-of-way. The common law rule provides that land may be dedicated to public use if there is both an offer and an acceptance. A government entity may accept the dedication of public right-of-way either by deed, by action through operating and maintaining the road with public funding, or by long continued use by the general public. In the absence of one of these acts of acceptance, the right-of-way dedication is not deemed to have been completed, and is therefore not available for public use until completion of the dedication. Based on the archive aerial photos of the site on PGAtlas, the alley (Parcel 121) and Osage Street do not appear to have been fully graded, maintained, or operated as public rights-of-way. Therefore, it appears that the right-of-way dedication of the alley and Osage Street has not been completed based on the common law rule. The alley and Osage Street are considered part of the abutting lots and will not require a vacation (Section 24-112 of the Subdivision Regulations). Staff would recommend that the applicant file a final plat for the property in accordance with Section 24-108 of the Subdivision Regulations, for which no preliminary plan is required, to incorporate Osage Street into the lots and to clarify the new property line.

Osage Street is shown as a 55-foot-wide right-of-way on the DSP. Osage Street was recorded as a 40-foot-wide right-of-way in Plat Book BDS 1-30 on July 6, 1906. A 15-foot-wide right-of-way dedication for Osage Street from Parcel B, to the south, was recorded in Plat Book NLP 103-15 on May 12, 1979. In accordance with the County Code, Section 7-132, all platted rights-of-way dedicated to public use by plat reference as of the year 1908 are automatically accepted without any action required on the part of the public entity within the County. Since the 15-foot-wide right-of-way dedication for Osage Street was recorded in a plat after 1908, it is considered as a completed dedication to public use and, therefore, a vacation would be required. The DSP shows the subject property line up to the 40-foot-wide right-of-way of Osage Street. The DSP does not show the 15-foot-wide right-of-way of Osage Street along Parcel B as part of the subject site for proposed development.

The DSP shows the site entrance driveway and a small portion of the proposed building for the CVS Pharmacy to be located within the Berwyn House Road right-of-way. This portion of Berwyn House Road was previously dedicated by deed in Liber 3689 Folio 567. The City of College Park needs to provide comments regarding the location of the site entrance driveway and the portion of the proposed building within the Berwyn House Road deed-dedicated right-of-way. Prior to approval of the DSP, the applicant should provide written documentation from the City of College Park regarding a

determination of the status of the portion of the Berwyn House Road right-of-way along the site. If the portion of the Berwyn House Road right-of-way along the site has not been abandoned or quit-claimed by the City of College Park, then the DSP should be revised to relocate the site entrance driveway and a small portion of the proposed building for the CVS Pharmacy to be outside of the Berwyn House Road right-of-way, which is owned in fee-simple by the City of College Park.

Section 24-111 of the Subdivision Regulations provides for exemptions from the requirement of filing a preliminary plan of subdivision for parcels with a record plat. Specifically, this property is subject to Section 24-111(c)(4) which provides:

(c) A final plat of subdivision approved prior to October 27, 1970, shall be resubdivided prior to the issuance of a building permit unless:

(4) The development of more than five thousand (5,000) square feet of gross floor area, which constitutes at least ten percent (10%) of the total area of the site, has been constructed pursuant to a building permit issued on or before December 31, 1991.

The property has a record plat approved prior to October 27, 1970. Based on the DSP, the total proposed land area for the site is 136,500 square feet and the existing development on the property is 17,976 square feet (13.16 percent of the total land area). Based on the archive aerial photos of the site on PGAtlas, the buildings have been in existence prior to 1991. It appears that the property is exempt from the requirement of filing a preliminary plan of subdivision by Section 24-111(c)(4) based on the existing conditions, information contained in the application, and PGAtlas. A note regarding the date of the construction of the existing buildings should be added to the DSP.

This DSP has some inconsistences that need to be addressed. It appears that no easements are provided for utilities on the DSP; therefore, an approved utilities plan should be provided to determine that adequate area exists for installation of utilities, and if a public utility easement should be required. Prior to certification of the DSP, the following technical corrections should be made:

(1) General Note 6 should be revised to reflect the correct total acreage for the site to include the 40-foot-wide right-of-way of Osage Street as shown on the Site, Grading and Utility Plan.

(2) Show all lot lines on the Site, Grading and Utility Plan.

(3) Label the master plan right-of-way and the dedication along Baltimore Avenue (US 1).

Failure of the site plan and record plat to match will result in building permits being placed on hold until the plans are corrected. There are no other subdivision issues at this time.

f. **Trails—**In a memorandum dated February 27, 2013, the trails coordinator provided the following summarized comments:

The area master plan recommends that the Walkable Node (which the subject site is located within) contain generous sidewalks along Baltimore Avenue (US 1) and all side streets, with a width between 15 to 20 feet along US 1, and 6 to 10 feet on the side streets (page 65). These widths provide space for outdoor dining and street trees along US 1 and a comfortable walking area on the side streets, while providing an adequate distance between the building frontages and the streets.

The area master plan states that sidewalk widths may vary where necessary to fulfill the vision of the Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan where the pavement is dedicated exclusively to pedestrian activity (page 263). The applicant's proposed sidewalks on US 1 range in dimensions between approximately 15 to 20 feet in width. The sidewalks are adequate and the total area dedicated to landscaping and sidewalk pavement will not interfere with future redevelopment or reconstruction of US 1 by SHA.

The area master plan recommends the developer/property owner is required to construct and maintain all the streetscape improvements of the proposed development (page 302). These improvements may include, but are not limited to, the installation of sidewalks, curbs and gutters, street trees, street furnishings, and the undergrounding of utilities where feasible or in accordance with any comprehensive undergrounding program that may be established to implement the recommendations of the sector plan.

The proposal is for a mixed-use building, and the applicant proposes the installation of sidewalks, curb and gutters, street trees, and street furnishings. Adequate sidewalk facilities are shown on the applicant's detailed site plan. The following table describes the sidewalks and bicycle facilities:

	SIDEWALKS		**BIKEWAYS**	
Location	**Master Plan Recommended Sidewalk Width**	**Proposed Sidewalk Width**	**Master Plan Recommended Bicycle Treatment**	**Proposed Bicycle Treatment**
Berwyn House Road	6 to 10 feet	8 feet	Shared Use Road	To Be Determined by City of College Park in Future
Baltimore Ave. (US 1)	15 to 20 feet	15 to 20 feet	Cycle Tracks or Bike Lanes	To Be Determined by SHA in Future
Pontiac Street	6 to 10 feet	6 feet	None	To Be Determined by City of College Park in Future

The subject site is located within the Walkable Node as described in the area master plan. Within the corridor infill and walkable node areas, a minimum of one bicycle parking space shall be provided within the public or private frontage for every three vehicular spaces. The applicant proposes an "alternative district standard" for the parking with 293 automobile parking spaces. The one-to-three ratio would then require 98 bicycle parking spaces based on the proposed amount of parking spaces. The applicant proposes 54 bicycle parking spaces, which is deficient by 44 spaces.

Based on the number of automobile parking spaces required by D-D-O standards, 115 spaces, the required number of bicycle parking spaces would be 39 spaces; therefore, staff believes that the proposed bicycle parking is adequate for the proposed use and will provide sufficient bicycle parking for the residents.

BICYCLE PARKING		
Master Plan Recommended Bicycle Parking	**D-D-O Required Automobile and Bicycle Parking**	**Proposed Alternative District Standard for Automobile and Bicycle Parking**
1 for every 3 Automobile Parking Spaces	115 Automobile Parking Spaces 39 Bicycle Parking Spaces (33 percent)	293 Automobile Parking Spaces 54 Bicycle Parking Spaces (18 percent)

Based on the preceding analysis, the Transportation Planning Section concludes that adequate bicycle and pedestrian transportation facilities exist to serve the proposed use if the application were to be approved.

g. **Permits—**In a memorandum dated January 24, 2013, the Permit Review Section offered numerous comments that have either been addressed by revisions to the plan or in the recommended conditions below.

h. **Environmental Planning—**In a memorandum dated March 20, 2013, the Environmental Planning Section offered a discussion of the DSP's conformance with the Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance as discussed in Finding 10 above, and the following additional comments:

The subject site has an approved Natural Resources Inventory (NRI-007-12) dated March 20, 2013 that was included with the application package. The site does not contain any streams or wetlands, but has 100-year floodplain associated with an off-site stream. The subject site contains 2.23 acres of 100-year floodplain, 0.16 acre wooded floodplain, 0.80 acre of net tract woodlands, and two specimen trees on-site.

A copy of the approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan and Letter (23848-2012) dated October 2, 2012 were submitted with the subject application. The concept plan appears to show all stormwater to be directed to two micro-bioretention ponds, then ultimately conveyed to the county storm drain system. There are two landscape planter boxes that will also infiltrate stormwater into the subsurface. According to the approval letter, water quantity and quality control on-site are not met and a fee is required. The DSP and Type 2 tree conservation plan (TCP2) are consistent with the concept plan.

According to the US Department of Agriculture (USDA), Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) Web Soil Survey (WSS), the predominant soils found to occur on-site include the Christina-Downer Complex, Christina-Downer-Urban land complex, and Urban land-Woodstown complex. According to available information, Marlboro clay is not found to occur on this property, but Christiana complex soil types are present.

Comment: Environmental Planning's suggested conditions have been included in the Recommendation section of this report.

i. **Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department—**In a memorandum dated January 29, 2013, the Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department offered comment on needed accessibility, private road design, and the location and performance of fire hydrants.

j. **Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T)—**In a memorandum dated March 11, 2013, DPW&T stated the site does not impact any county-maintained roadways. Baltimore Avenue (US 1) is a state-maintained roadway, and coordination with SHA is required. The right-of-way for Osage Street was dedicated prior to 1908 and was never accepted for maintenance by the county. DPW&T has no current or future plans for improving the Osage Street right-of-way; therefore, they have no objection to the land being included in the development. Floodplain waiver approval is required for the proposed development. The subject DSP is consistent with approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan 23848-2012, dated October 3, 2012.

k. **Prince George's County Police Department—**In a memorandum dated January 22, 2013, the Police Department indicated that they reviewed the DSP and there are no crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) related issues at this time.

l. **Prince George's County Health Department—**In a memorandum dated February 1, 2013, the Environmental Engineering Program of the Prince George's County Health Department provided the following comments on the subject application:

(1) The statement of justification makes reference to a lighting plan, but no lighting plan was received for review. There is an increasing body of scientific research suggesting that artificial light pollution can have lasting adverse impacts on human health. The plan should indicate that all proposed exterior light fixtures will be shielded and positioned so as to minimize light trespass caused by spill light.

Comment: The submitted DSP includes a photometric plan and light specifications; however, there are no details regarding the shielding on the light fixtures. Therefore, a condition has been included in the Recommendation section of this report requiring this be added prior to certification.

(2) Historic aerial photography indicates the existence of an automobile based sales, service, and repair facility on the property from at least 1965 through approximately 2010. Due to this history and the potential for petroleum contamination of both soils and groundwater frequently associated with automobile based operations, it is recommended that an environmental site assessment be completed, and/or such a report be submitted for review at least 35 days prior to the Planning Board hearing.

Comment: The applicant should take note of this request; however, it cannot be enforced with this DSP approval.

(3) The property is located in an area of the county considered a "food desert," where affordable and healthy food is difficult to obtain. Records indicate that within a half-mile radius of this location, there are 17 existing carry-out/convenience store food facilities, but only 2 markets/grocery stores. Research has found that people who live near an abundance of fast-food restaurants and convenience stores compared to grocery stores and fresh produce vendors, have a significantly higher prevalence of obesity and diabetes. As such, the developer should consider a retail tenant that would provide additional healthy food choices to the area.

Comment: The applicant should take note of this suggestion; however, specific retail tenants cannot be required for the subject development.

(4) During the demolition/construction phases of this project, no dust should be allowed to cross over property lines and impact adjacent properties. Indicate intent to conform to construction activity dust control requirements as specified in the 2011 Maryland Standards and Specifications for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control.

Comment: This requirement will be enforced at the time of permit; however, a note should be provided on the DSP indicating conformance with these requirements.

(5) During the demolition/construction phases of this project, no noise should be allowed to adversely impact activities on the adjacent properties. Indicate intent to conform to construction activity noise control requirements as specified in Subtitle 19 of the Prince George's County Code.

Comment: This requirement will be enforced at the time of permit; however, a note should be provided on the DSP indicating conformance with these requirements.

m. **Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA)—**In a letter dated March 4, 2013, SHA offered comments on the subject DSP including the submitted traffic impact study. They concluded that they concurred with the proposed access points, a revised traffic impact study is required to include additional intersections and mitigation, and that design is underway for the reconstruction of Baltimore Avenue (US 1), which could have impacts along the frontage of the subject property. The applicant has decided to proceed with the subject DSP approval prior to final resolution of these issues. If these issues ultimately require layout changes, a revision to the DSP will have to be submitted for review.

n. **Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)—**In a memorandum received January 24, 2013, WSSC offered comments regarding needed coordination with other buried utilities, suggested modifications to the plans to better reflect WSSC facilities, and procedures for the applicant to follow to establish water and sewer service.

o. **Verizon—** At the time of the writing of this technical staff report, Verizon has not offered comments on the subject application.

p. **Potomac Electric Power Company (PEPCO)—** At the time of the writing of this technical staff report, PEPCO has not offered comments on the subject application.

q. **University of Maryland—** At the time of the writing of this technical staff report, the University of Maryland has not offered comments on the subject application.

r. **City of College Park—**At the time of the writing of this staff report, the City of College Park has not provided comments on the subject project. They are scheduled to hold a work session to consider the proposed plan on April 2, 2013 and to vote on the application on April 9, 2013.

s. **Town of Berwyn Heights—**At the time of the writing of this technical staff report, the Town of Berwyn Heights has not offered comments on the subject application.

t. **City of Greenbelt—**At the time of the writing of this technical staff report, the City of Greenbelt has not offered comments on the subject application.

13. The subject application adequately takes into consideration the requirements of the D-D-O Zone and the Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and SMA. The amendments to the development district standards required for this development would benefit the development and the development district as required by Section 27-548.25(c) of the Zoning Ordinance, and would not substantially impair implementation of the sector plan.

    Based on the foregoing and as required by Section 27-285(b)(1) 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.

14. Per Section 27-285(b)(4) of the Zoning Ordinance, which became effective on September 1, 2010, a required finding for approval of a detailed site plan is as follows:

    (4) The Planning Board may approve a Detailed Site Plan if it finds that the regulated environmental features have been preserved and/or restored in a natural state to the fullest extent possible.

    Comment: In a memorandum dated March 20, 2013, the Environmental Planning staff indicated that the regulated environmental features on the subject property have been preserved and/or restored to the fullest extent possible based on the limits of disturbance shown on the tree conservation plan submitted for review. The impacts approved are for the construction of a parking garage, hotel/retail buildings, bioretention facilities, paved areas, and landscaping/hardscaping.

RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the foregoing evaluation and analysis, the Urban Design staff recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and recommends APPROVAL of the application as follows:

A. Staff recommends that the Planning Board recommend to the District Council APPROVAL of the rezoning request to rezone approximately 0.86 acre in the One-Family Detached Residential (R-55) Zone to the Mixed Use–Infill (M-U-I) Zone.

B. Staff recommends APPROVAL of the alternative development district standards for:

    1. Pages 228 and 230—Mandatory shop frontage with a zero-foot build-to-line along the US 1 frontage (to allow an 18-foot build-to-line along US 1)

    2. Page 234—The maximum front build-to-line principal of ten feet (to allow an 18-foot build-to-line along US 1)

3. Page 234—The principal building height of two stories minimum (to allow Building 2 to be a one-story building)

4. Page 239—The required number of parking spaces for the proposed hotel and retail uses (to allow a larger amount of provided parking spaces, specifically 293)

5. Page 239—The minimum number of required bicycle parking spaces (to allow the applicant to provide 54 bicycle parking spaces, instead of the required 98)

6. Page 254—Freestanding signs shall not be permitted (to allow for four, small, way-finding, freestanding signs on-site)

7. Page 254—The maximum area of nine square feet for any single sign mounted perpendicular to a façade (to allow for a maximum area of 36 square feet for any single sign mounted perpendicular to a given façade)

8. Page 255—Not permitted: pole-mounted signs (to allow for four, small, way-finding, pole-mounted signs)

9. Page 257—All at-grade walks and pathways shall be constructed with pervious materials (to allow the applicant to use impervious materials for all paving)

10. Page 257—Underground or above-grade cisterns shall be integrated into the site plan (to allow the applicant not to provide cisterns, but rather use bioretention ponds and planters for stormwater purposes)

C. Staff recommends DISAPPROVAL of the alternative development district standard for:

1. Page 256—Within the walkable node, to obtain a minimum of LEED Silver (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) certification (to allow the applicant to obtain no LEED certification, but rather incorporate a host of sustainable and smart growth elements)

D. Staff recommends APPROVAL of Detailed Site Plan DSP-12034 for Keane Enterprises, Inc. and Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan TCP-2-002-13, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certification, the applicant shall revise the plans as follows or provide the specified documentation:

a. Revise the detailed site plan (DSP) as follows:

(1) Revise all notes regarding the square footage of retail space to match and provide a breakdown of the number of retail units within the hotel building and their square footages.

(2) Provide a plan note that indicates conformance to construction activity dust control requirements as specified in the 2011 Maryland Standards and Specifications for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control.

(3) Provide a plan note that indicates the applicant’s intent to conform to construction activity noise control requirements as specified in

Subtitle 19 of the Prince George's County Code.

(4) Indicate that all proposed exterior light fixtures will use full cut-off optics and be shielded and positioned so as to minimize light trespass caused by spill light.

(5) Provide a Tree Canopy Coverage schedule showing the requirement being met on-site.

(6) Revise the plan to correctly reflect and label dedication to the State Highway Administration (SHA) of the required right-of-way for the entire property frontage along Baltimore Avenue (US 1) per the most recent SHA planning drawings for US 1, and/or as approved by the 2010 *Approved Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment.*

(7) Revise the plan to reflect Parcel 121 as an alley.

(8) General Note 6 shall be revised to reflect the correct total acreage for the site to include the 40-foot-wide right-of-way of Osage Street as shown on the Site, Grading and Utility Plan.

(9) Show all existing and proposed lot lines on the Site, Grading and Utility Plan.

(10) Provide written documentation from the City of College Park agreeing to the conveyance of the portion of the Berwyn House Road and Osage Street rights-of-way which are proposed to be included in the DSP.

(11) Add a note regarding the date of the construction of the existing buildings.

(12) Provide proof of compliance with Federal Aviation Regulation Part 77.

(13) Provide an approved utilities plan to determine that adequate area exists for installation of utilities, and if a public utility easement should be required.

(14) Add a note to the DSP that all loading area access doors shall remain closed, except during times of entrance and exiting of vehicles.

(15) Revise General Note 7D to delete the shared parking factor calculation, and the baseline assumptions for the parking calculations shall be revised to the walkable node requirements.

(16) Revise the plan to move the proposed monument signs out of the proposed US 1 right-of-way dedication or provide documentation from SHA that the proposed locations are acceptable.

(17) Revise the plans to include a location for a proposed bike share station.

b. Revise the architecture as follows:

(1) Redesign Building 2 to include a two-story façade appearance and to incorporate additional traditional storefront architectural treatment along the Berwyn House Road elevation.

(2) Refine the design of the parking garage structure to incorporate additional high-quality materials and detailing along the façades visible from Baltimore Avenue (US 1), Berwyn House Road, and Pontiac Street, to better reflect the architecture of the associated hotel building and provide a more attractive public face.

(3) Revise the signage sheet to indicate the approved signage standard amendments.

c. Revise the Type 2 tree conservation plan (TCP2) as follows:

(1) Revise the woodland conservation worksheet to match the woodland preservation acreage on the plan view of the TCP2.

(2) Have the revised plan signed and dated by the qualified professional preparing the plan.

2. Total development within the subject property shall be limited to development which generates no more than 129 AM and 246 PM peak-hour vehicle trips.

3. Prior to issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following improvements shall (1) have full financial assurance, (2) have been permitted for construction by the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) for part (a), and the City of College Park for (b), and (3) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with SHA and the City:

a. The provision of any traffic signal modifications, pedestrian/ bike push buttons and count-down displays at all approaches, and inclusion of highly-visible and well-delineated pedestrian crosswalks and stop bars on all approaches at the intersections of Baltimore Avenue (US 1) with Berwyn House Road per SHA and the City of College Park standards.

b. The provision of wide pedestrian crosswalks on all approaches of Pontiac Street and Baltimore Avenue (US 1), if deemed necessary by the City of College Park.

4. Prior to issuance of any permits which impact the 100-year floodplain, the applicant shall submit copies of all federal and state wetland permits, if required, along with evidence that approval conditions have been complied with, and associated mitigation plans.

5. Prior to issuance of any building permits, provide proof of application to the U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC) for LEED Silver (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) or better certification.

6. Prior to the issuance of the first use and occupancy permit, obtain LEED Silver or better certification for the proposed development.