

Case No. SP-06096

Applicant: Columbia Properties, LLC

COUNTY COUNCIL OF PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND,
SITTING AS THE DISTRICT COUNCIL

ORDER AFFIRMING PLANNING BOARD DECISION, WITH CONDITIONS

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, after review of the administrative record, that the decision of the Planning Board in PGCPB No. 08-61, to approve with conditions a detailed site plan for the construction of three Marriott Hotels, including the Courtyard (five stories); the Residence Inn (five stories); and Springhill Suites (five stories), on property described as approximately 10.05 acres of land in the M-X-T Zone, in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of Melford Boulevard and Science Drive, Bowie, is:

AFFIRMED, for the reasons stated by the Planning Board, whose decision is hereby adopted as the findings of fact and conclusions of law of the District Council in this case.

Affirmance of the Planning Board's decision is subject to the following conditions:

1. If any development of the subject property combined with that of all other properties approved under Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-98076 would cumulatively generate more than 2,200 AM and 2,605 PM trips, a new preliminary plan with a new traffic impact study shall be required prior to approval of the detailed site plan.
2. In conformance with the Approved Master Plan for Bowie and Vicinity and Sectional Map Amendment and CR-11-2006, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide a standard sidewalk along the subject site's frontage of Melford Boulevard, from the vicinity of the storage shed at Springhill Suites to Science Drive, unless modified by the State Highway Administration.
3. Prior to certification of the DSP, the TCP II shall be revised to correctly show the 150-foot, 100-year floodplain buffer.

4. Prior to certification of the DSP, the TCP II and DSP shall be revised to show all water, sewer, and stormdrain connections and their associated easements. The plan shall also show the ten-foot public utility easement. No woodland conservation should be shown in any easements.
5. Prior to certification of the DSP, the TCP II shall be revised to reflect the correct woodland acreage, in accordance with the signed TCP I associated with CSP-06002, or a revised forest stand delineation shall be submitted that clarifies the acreages.
6. The TCP II shall be revised to eliminate the floodplain-related acreages from the worksheet for this phase of development, or a 100-year floodplain study shall be submitted that clarifies the acreages.
7. Prior to certification of the DSP, the TCP II shall be revised as follows:
 - a. Submit a TCP II that covers the entire site of the approved TCP I, and show a phased worksheet on the cover of the plan.
 - b. Revise the plan so that it is at a scale of 1 inch = 50 feet.
 - c. Revise the TCP II so that it is in conformance with the TCP I associated with CSP-06002.
 - d. Submit a single lot revision worksheet for the site.
 - e. Eliminate all woodland conservation from the water, sewer, stormdrain, and ten-foot public utility easements.
 - f. Show the correct sign detail with posts.
 - g. Update the revision box to reflect changes to this TCP II and reference the subject application.
 - h. Revise the TCP signature block to reflect all previous approvals in typeface.
 - i. Eliminate the proposed tree line from the plan.
 - j. In the legend, revise "tree conservation area" to "woodland preservation area."
 - k. Specify in the legend the type of woodland conservation for each symbol (i.e., woodland preservation, woodland afforestation).
 - l. Show the required reforestation notes and edge management notes.

- m. After all these revisions have been made, have the qualified professional who prepared the plan sign and date it.
- 8. Prior to certification of the DSP, the applicant shall submit copies of the approved stormwater management concept plan and letter. The concept must be correctly reflected on the TCP II.
- 9. A note shall be placed on the plans that all decorative banners and signs shall be prohibited from the site other than jurisdictional flags.
- 10. Prior to signature approval of the plans:
 - a. The applicant shall redesign the dumpster enclosures such that they are uniform and match the courtyard wall enclosure behind the Courtyard Hotel. The corners of the dumpsters shall have columns with end caps matching those in the courtyard area.
 - b. The landscape schedules shall be added to the plans to demonstrate conformance to the Landscape Manual.
 - c. The retaining wall proposed along Old Crain Drive located within the Public Utility Easement (PUE) shall be relocated and adjusted such that it is clearly outside of the PUE.
 - d. The architectural elevations for the Spring Hill Suites shall be revised to add brick as an exterior finish to the endwall and wrap the brick to the nearest front façade projection, and revise the signage to reflect better integration into the building façade.
 - e. All renderings shall be revised or corrected to show structures, including façade treatments, as they were presented to the District Council at its hearing on 22 September 2008, and modified in accordance with condition 10f.
 - f. All three hotels shall have their brick and accent materials coordinated. Each hotel shall have facades with, at a minimum, 75% brick, with the remaining material being either stone or EIFS (Exterior Insulation and Finish System). No siding of any kind will be used on any of the hotels.
- 11. The square footage of all of the signage and the height of the monument sign shall be consistent with other approved signage and monument signs in the Melford development.
- 12. The applicant shall include a tracking table on the plans that shows how much square footage has been approved for the entire Melford development and how much is proposed for the subject site, and calculate the floor area ratio proposed.

13. As requested by the City of Bowie, the applicant should consider applying green building techniques to the site, including such features as a green roof.

Ordered this 20th day of October, 2008, by the following vote:

In Favor: Council Members Dean, Bland, Campos, Dernoga, Exum, Harrison, Knotts, Olson
and Turner

Opposed:

Abstained:

Absent:

Vote: 9-0

COUNTY COUNCIL OF PRINCE GEORGE'S
COUNTY, MARYLAND, SITTING AS THE
DISTRICT COUNCIL FOR THAT PART OF
THE MARYLAND-WASHINGTON
REGIONAL DISTRICT IN PRINCE GEORGE'S
COUNTY, MARYLAND

By: _____
Samuel H. Dean, Chairman

ATTEST:

Redis C. Floyd
Clerk of the Council