



THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

PGCPB No. 16-108

14741 Governor Oden Bowie Drive
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772
TTY: (301) 952-4366
www.mncppc.org/pgco

File No. DSP-15041

RESOLUTION

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

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on September 22, 2016 regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-15041 for Staybridge Suites at Largo, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** With the subject detailed site plan (DSP), the applicant proposes to construct an 83,991-square-foot, 104-room hotel.
2. **Location:** The subject property is located on the east side of Lottsford Road north of its intersection with Apollo Drive. The site is in Planning Area 73, Council District 6. The site is zoned Mixed Use-Infill (M-U-I) and is subject to the Development District Overlay (D-D-O) Zone standards in the 2013 *Approved Largo Town Center Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (Largo Town Center Sector Plan and SMA).
3. **Surrounding Uses:** The subject site is surrounded by properties in the M-U-I Zone and all are within the D-D-O Zone. Immediately to the north and east are existing office buildings; to the west, across Lottsford Road, is property owned by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) and used for underground storage; and to the south, across Apollo Drive, are existing office buildings, a U.S. Post Office, Wells Fargo bank and Rite Aid Pharmacy.
4. **Development Data Summary:**

	EXISTING	APPROVED
Zone(s)	M-U-I/ D-D-O	M-U-I/D-D-O
Use	Vacant	Hotel
Acreage	3.56	3.56
Lot	1	1
Total gross floor area (sq. ft.)	0	83,911

OTHER DEVELOPMENT DATA

Parking Requirements per 2013 Largo Town Center Sector Plan and SMA

The following table outlines the parking that is required by-right within the Largo Town Center D-D-O Zone for the proposed development:

Use	Description	Total Required	Maximum Allowed	Total Provided
Lodging/Hotel	Min. 0.75/guest room Max. 1.00/guest room	78	104	103
	Min. 4.0 spaces/1,000 sq. ft. meeting room/703 sq. ft.	3	--	3
	Max. 5.00 spaces/1,000 sq. ft. meeting room/703 sq. ft.	--	4	
Total Parking		81	108	106 (Including 101/standard 5 handicapped 1 van accessible handicapped)

Bicycle Spaces Per Sector Plan

Required

1 space per 3 parking spaces

Provided

8 bicycle spaces

Loading Spaces

(per Section 27-582*)

10,000–100,000 gross floor area (GFA)

1 space

1 space

Note: *The Largo Town Center Sector Plan and SMA does not have specific requirements for the number of loading spaces; therefore, the applicable section of the Zoning Ordinance serves as the requirement.

5. **Prior approvals:** The subject property has a Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-82133 which was approved on February 10, 1983, and an approved Detailed Site Plan DSP-04085 which was approved on January 5, 2006 (PBCPB Resolution No. 05-252). At that time, the property was in the 1-3 Zone. The site was rezoned to M-U-I as part of the 2013 Largo Town Center Sector Plan and SMA.

The subject property also has an approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan, 327-2005-01, dated April 26, 2016 and is valid until April 26, 2019.

6. **Design Features:** The applicant is proposing a five-story, 104-room hotel oriented toward Lottsford Road. The plan view on sheet C4.0 should be revised to reflect the correct number of proposed hotel rooms. Access to the 83,911-square-foot hotel is via two right-in, right-out driveways from Lottsford Road. The building is surrounded by a 22-foot-wide drive aisle with the

majority of the parking on the north, west and south sides of the hotel. Trash enclosures and loading are provided at the northeast corner of the site.

Architecture—The proposed hotel is five stories, fronting Lottsford Road. The exterior elevations are generally clad with red brick for the first two stories, and faced with a light-colored exterior insulation finishing system (EIFS) for the upper three stories. The upper floors are accented with EIFS panels in a complementary green shade. Outward projecting vertical bays of varying widths are proposed to extend from grade to the fifth story, which serve to break up the building's horizontal mass. The top of the building is further accented with painted cornices, and the entrance is covered by a metal gable roof. The interior courtyard elevations present a balance of architectural elements. Color interior north and west elevations should be provided prior to certification of the DSP to ensure continuity of materials and colors with the exterior façades.

The hotel will feature an indoor pool, outdoor seating areas, fully equipped kitchens, a 24-hour business center, a small retail area to purchase convenience items, a fitness center, and a laundry room.

Signage—The applicant submitted a sign plan that includes freestanding and building-mounted project identification signage. The applicant is proposing two modest building-mounted signs with the brand logo approximately 65.5 square feet each in area on the west and south elevations. The applicant should clarify on the sign detail sheet the type of letters proposed, and include the D-D-O Zone required calculation and allowable square footage to ensure conformance with the applicable standard. The applicant is also proposing one monument sign at the southern entrance to the site. A metal sign approximately 25 square feet in area is proposed atop a three-foot-high brick veneer base with stone cap that will match the brick on the hotel building. The monument sign will present the same brand logo as the building-mounted signs. The entire monument sign is six feet in height and approximately 10.5 feet in length, which includes a curved metal overhang feature. The applicant is requesting an amendment to the applicable D-D-O Zone sign standard for the monument sign, which is discussed in Finding 7(e) below. The allowable and provided sign height/ area calculations should be provided on the sign detail sheet. The letters are internally lit, which should be noted on the detail sheet.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **2013 Approved Largo Town Center Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment and the standards of the Development District Overlay (D-D-O) Zone:** The 2013 *Approved Largo Town Center Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (Largo Town Center Sector Plan and SMA) defines long-range land use and development policies, detailed zoning changes, design standards, and a D-D-O Zone for the Largo Town Center. The land use concept of the sector plan divides the entire area into five distinct subarea: the Northwest Quadrant, the Northeast Quadrant, the Southeast Quadrant, the Southwest Quadrant (TOD Core), and East Area (East of Landover Road). The subject property is located in the Northeast Quadrant.

The overall vision for the Largo Town Center includes a high-density, mixed-use core bordered to the north by an expanded government services district and health-related activities. Medium- to high-density residential development rings the sector area's southeast quadrant between Arena Drive and Harry S Truman Drive, east of Lottsford Road.

Section 27-548.25(b) of the Zoning Ordinance requires that the Planning Board find that the site plan meets the applicable development district standards in order to approve it. The development district standards are organized into multiple categories: Building Form, Existing Residential, Architectural Elements, Sustainability and the Environment, and Streets and Open Spaces. However, in accordance with the D-D-O Zone review process, modification of the development district standards is permitted. In order to allow the plan to deviate from the development district standards, the Planning Board must find that the alternative development district standards will benefit the development and the development district and will not substantially impair implementation of the sector plan.

With the conditions attached, the subject application will conform to all of the recommendations and requirements, except for those from which the applicant has requested an amendment. In areas where the Planning Board approved the amendment, the Planning Board finds that granting the amendment will not substantially impair implementation of the sector plan.

The applicant requests amendments of the following development district standards:

a. **Urban Design Criteria/Build-to Line (page 135)**

9. **BTLs shall be located within 15 feet back from the Pedestrian Zone, and the full width from face of curb to building front should not exceed 25 feet.**

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

"At its closest point, the vestibule at the front entry of the proposed hotel building is located approximately 113 feet behind the curb line of Lottsford Road. The primary plane of the front of the building however is in general set back approximately 122 feet from the curb line of Lottsford Road. There are two reasons why the 25 foot BTL is not met in this instance. First, development on both sides of Lottsford Road has generally already been established. Buildings which have been constructed are set back from Lottsford Road and do not meet the 25 foot BTL requirement. In fact, most buildings have surface parking between the building and Lottsford Road. Constructing this hotel at the 25 foot BTL will create an irregular appearance along Lottsford Road. A photograph of this section of Lottsford Road with the hotel building footprint overlaid in a manner to satisfy the 25 foot BTL is marked Exhibit "T" and attached hereto. As can be seen from a review of this overlay, meeting the 25 foot BTL would create an awkward and irregular development pattern along Lottsford Road. There is a

second, and perhaps more important reason why the 25 foot BTL is not met. Hotels are a unique use. Due to patron convenience and safety concerns, all patrons desire to park as close to the front of the building as possible. This provides for more convenient and safer entry into the facility, especially during nighttime hours. Therefore, it is an absolute necessity for parking to be located in substantial numbers adjoining the front of the building. As can be seen from a review of the site plan, the parking field which is proposed to be located in front of the building between the face of the building and Lottsford Road would prevent meeting the 25 foot BTL...”

The applicant states that security concerns make it necessary to provide parking at the front of the building, which necessitates a greater building setback. In addition, the proposed layout is consistent with the prevailing pattern established by existing development. The Planning Board concurs that hotels have specific security requirements and acknowledges the existing development pattern of the office park. For these reasons, the Planning Board supports the amendment request.

b. Urban Design Criteria/Frontage (page 138)

- 1. The percent of building frontage shall be 70-100 percent of the block length (or individual lot).**

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

“The front of the Property consists of approximately 510 linear feet of street frontage. The hotel building has approximately 248 feet of width along the building front. Therefore, the building width amounts to only approximately 48 percent of the lot width. A modification from this standard is therefore requested. Again, the width of the building is dictated by several factors. One of course is the number of rooms when viewed in context with the number of floors. This hotel is proposed to have 104 rooms spread over five floors in height (which meets the height requirement in the Sector Plan). By necessity, 104 rooms dispersed over five floors will in large measure dictate the width of the building. In addition, and as noted previously, parking is provided on either side of the building, once again to promote customer convenience and safety. Doors will be located on the sides of the hotel building providing access to cars parked in those areas late in the evening. Even if the building could be constructed to be wider, the location of the parking spaces would prohibit a wider building than the applicant is proposing.”

The Largo Town Center development district standards require new buildings within the Northwest, Northeast, or Southeast Quadrants to occupy 70–100 percent of the individual lot frontage or block length. The applicant requests an amendment because the location of

required parking for the proposed hotel will restrict the maximum frontage of the building to less than 50 percent of the lot frontage. The applicant also cited the distribution of only 104-hotel rooms over five floors as another factor restricting the maximum frontage percentage of the hotel. Based on these limitations, the Planning Board supports the applicant's request.

c. **Parking Design Criteria/ Surface Parking Lots and Structured Parking Garages**
(page 165)

1. **All surface parking lots or structured parking garages shall be accommodated mid-block or below grade and screened from the public realm. Structured parking should be located internal to blocks or below grade.**
4. **In instances where surface parking lots front a street...the parking shall be set back a minimum of 40 feet from the BTL...**

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

"The Property is an individual building lot. The parking for the hotel must be provided on Lot 27. Therefore, surface parking cannot be provided "mid-block." In addition, structured parking is not economically feasible for a single lot use such as the proposed hotel. Further, given the unique nature of the hotel use and the requirement to establish parking in front of the main entrance to the building, the surface parking cannot be set back 40 feet from BTL."

The Planning Board concurs that the subject property consists of just one building lot, and therefore there is no practical way to provide parking "mid-block." Structured parking for a 104-room hotel is not feasible option. The Planning Board further concurs that security concerns make it impractical for surface parking to be set back 40 feet from the build-to line (BTL) as required by the standard. Given the unique security and design requirements of hotels, the Planning Board finds the requested amendments to be appropriate and reasonable and, therefore, supports the amendment requests.

d. **Signage Design Criteria/Freestanding and Monument Signs** (pages 173-174)

4. **Smaller commercial and mixed-use developments containing a minimum of 15,000 square feet but not exceeding 100,000 square feet shall be permitted a maximum of one ground-mounted monument sign not exceeding four feet in height or a maximum of 24 square feet.**

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

"Pursuant to the standards set forth on page 173 of the Sector Plan text, one monument sign is permitted for smaller and mixed use developments containing a minimum of 15,000 square feet but not exceeding 100,000 square feet. Under that criterion, the height of the sign is recommended not to exceed 4 feet in height with a maximum area of 24 square feet. For larger commercial or mixed-use developments exceeding 100,000 square feet, a monument sign not exceeding six feet in height and 50 square feet in area is permitted...[T]he hotel is proposed to include 83,911 gross square feet of floor area. This area is quite close to the 100,000 square foot minimum area which would allow a 6 foot high monument sign. The area of the monument sign being proposed is approximately 25 square feet. Regardless of the appropriate Development Standards to be applied to the monument sign being proposed by the applicant, it is submitted that the sign is tasteful and that if a minor modification is necessary, it should be approved to allow the proposed sign. A sign 6 feet in height is in scale and appropriate in the area. Further, while the square footage of the sign being proposed is slightly in excess of the 24 square feet permitted for mixed-use developments as small as 15,000 square feet, the project is 83,911 square feet. The sign is within the square footage allowed for projects exceeding 100,000 square feet. The sign is in scale for the proposed hotel and the Applicant submits a smaller sign will not adequately provide notice to patrons arriving by motor vehicle."

The applicable sign standard for the subject proposal is one monument sign, not to exceed four feet in height or 24 square feet in area. The Planning Board concurs with the applicant in that the proposed sign is not excessive, but is in scale with the proposed building as well as existing development. For these reasons, the Planning Board supports the amendment request.

e. **Architectural Design Criteria/Building Form (Page 159)**

Fenestration

1. **The relationship between solid building wall and openings (fenestration) is critical; the ratios should vary according to use and shall be calculated per elevation and floor to-floor:**

Percentage of openings (windows and doors)

Ground Floor Retail: 60-95

Ground Floor Other

Commercial/Institutional: 40-90

Ground Floor Residential: 15-40

Upper Floor Commercial/Institutional: 40-90

Upper Floor Residential: 15-60

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

"The matrix prepared by the architect indicates that the proposed hotel will conform to virtually every architectural design standard with one exception. The fenestration percentage requirements relating to the percentage of openings along building walls are not satisfied for either the ground floor or upper floors. A minimum of 15 percent is required, and most of the proposed hotel elevations provide between 12 and 13 percent. On the upper floor north elevation, only 2 percent is provided. However, given the overall attractive architecture being proposed, the applicant submits that a modification is appropriate since the architectural detail of the proposed hotel building more than conforms to the overall architectural development standards as specified in the Sector Plan."

The Planning Board concurs that the majority of the architecture is in compliance with the development district standards, and is effectively in compliance with all the standards with the exception of the fenestration on the upper north elevation. This elevation does not front along a public street or other public area, but faces another parking area and office building. For these reasons, the Planning Board supports the amendment request.

f. **Architectural Design/Building Form (page 163)**

Roofs

1. **Roofs should preferably be flat (except on single-family residential units) or symmetrically pitched between a 6:12 and 14:12 slope and only in the configuration of gables and hips.**

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

"It should be noted that the architect's matrix states that a portion of the building fails to comply with the requirement for a flat roof as set forth on page 163 of the Sector Plan text. The applicant believes that in reality, this standard is met and satisfied. The hotel building itself has a flat roof. There is a pitched roof over the vestibule which is proposed to be constructed at a 5:12 pitch. In addition, the roof over secondary entries and over the pool and barbecue area is proposed to be a pitched roof at a 3:12 pitch. These are very small pitched roofs, and it is the applicant's position that they are not even covered by this Development Standard. Therefore, the applicant submits no modification is needed."

The above standard is not mandatory; therefore, the Planning Board concurs with the applicant's conclusion that an amendment is not needed in this instance.

8. **Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance:** The DSP application has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements of the Mixed Use-Infill (M-U-I) Zone, and the requirements of the Development District Overlay (D-D-O) Zone of the Zoning Ordinance as follows:

- a. The general purpose of the M-U-I Zone is to encourage a mix of residential and commercial uses as infill development in areas which are already substantially developed, as recommended in an applicable plan--the 2013 Largo Town Center Sector Plan and SMA.

Section 27-546.19, Site Plans for Mixed Uses provides findings for those cases where more than one use is proposed on a single lot. In this case, a single use is proposed for Lot 27. Nonetheless, the site plan is in conformance with the required findings subject to approval of the requested amendments to the applicable development district standards. In addition, the application is in conformance with the compatibility standards and practices that minimize adverse impacts to, and encourage compatibility with, adjoining properties and the surrounding neighborhood.

- b. 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, this DSP complies with most of the applicable D-D-O Zone standards with the exception of the six standards for which amendments are requested. The Planning Board approves the alternative development standards because they will benefit the development and the district, and will not substantially impair the implementation of the sector plan.
- c. The applicant has proposed a site plan in accordance with Section 27-283, site design guidelines, of the Zoning Ordinance that further cross-references the same guidelines as stated in Section 27-274, specifically in regard to parking, loading, internal circulation, service areas, and lighting. Landscaping, where not provided for in the sector plan, has been provided in accordance with the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* (Landscape Manual) requirements.

9. **The requirements of Preliminary Plan 4-82133 and Record Plat:** The subject site (Lot 27) is part of the larger 82.7-acre Inglewood Business Park approved in the early 1980s as part of Preliminary Plan 4-82133 and recorded in Plat Book NLP 122 at Plat 25. At that time, the site was in the 1-3 (Planned Industrial/Employment Park) Zone. Lot 27 was approved for a 60,983-square-foot office building that would have generated 122 AM and 113 PM peak-hour trips. The proposed use will generate 55 AM and 58 PM peak-hour trips, which is within the approved trip cap. No other conditions are relevant to the review of this DSP.

10. **Prince George's County Landscape Manual:** Per page 127 of the Largo Town Center Sector Plan and SMA, if a development standard is not covered in the plan area D-D-O Zone, the applicable sections of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* (Landscape Manual)

shall serve as the requirement. The provisions of the Landscape Manual regarding commercial and industrial landscaped strip requirements (Section 4.2) are superseded by requirements for a tree zone, therefore, the landscape plan schedule for Section 4.2 should be deleted. The DSP is subject to the requirements for Section 4.3, Parking Lot Requirements; Section 4.4, Screening Requirements; Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses; and, Section 4.9 of the Landscape Manual.

- a. **Section 4.3.1, Parking Lot Requirements**—Requires parking areas over 7,000 square feet have planted perimeters adjacent to property lines. The applicant has provided a schedule that indicates conformance with the requirements; however, the landscape plan should label the bufferyard and the width provided to ensure conformance with this section. In addition, the existing trees credited in the schedule should be labeled on the plan with the species and caliper information.
- b. **Section 4.3.2, Parking Lot Requirements**—Requires that a certain amount of interior planting be provided in parking areas over 7,000 square feet. In general, it appears that trees and shrubs have been counted in areas outside of the required bufferyard, and in particular, are shown in the designated loading area. The landscape plan shall be revised to show the required amount of plantings within the interior parking area.
- c. **Section 4.4, Screening Requirements**—Requires that loading and maintenance areas be screened from residential properties and street, that trash facilities be completely concealed, and that all mechanical equipment be screened from adjacent properties, streets and parking facilities. The applicant is providing a trash enclosure for the proposed dumpsters that is shown on the DSP and detail sheet.
- d. **Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses**—The site is subject to Section 4.7, however, the adjoining office uses are deemed compatible. The landscape plan shall be revised to indicate the ownership, zoning and uses of the adjacent properties.
- e. **Section 4.9, Sustainable Landscaping Requirements**—Requires that a percentage of the proposed plant materials be native plants. A schedule demonstrating conformance with the requirement has been provided. It is noted that the Plant Schedule indicates that 505 shrubs are proposed while the Section 4.9 schedule indicates 502 shrubs are proposed. The two schedules shall indicate the same number and type of proposed plant material.

11. **Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance:** This property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance (WCO) because the site is subject to approved Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCP II-085-05-01). An '-01' revision to TCP II-085-05 was submitted with the application.

The woodland conservation threshold for this 3.56-acre property is 15 percent of the net tract area or 0.53 acre. The total woodland conservation requirement based on the amount of clearing shown on the plan is 1.05 acres. The woodland conservation requirement has not changed from the

previous approved plan and has been satisfied entirely with off-site woodland conservation credits recorded in the land records (L.29821 F. 476).

The tree conservation plan (TCP) requires a number of technical revisions to be in conformance with the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance. Recommended revisions have all been included as conditions in the approval of this application.

12. **The Prince George's County Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance:** The DSP is subject to the requirements of the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance. Section 25-128 of the Prince George's County Code requires a minimum percentage of tree canopy coverage (TCC) on properties that require a grading permit. Properties zoned M-U-I are required to provide a minimum of ten percent of the gross tract area in tree canopy.

	REQUIRED	APPROVED
Tree Canopy	15,507 sq. ft.	21,761 sq. ft.

The overall development has a gross tract area of 3.56 acres and, as such, a TCC of 0.356 acre, or 15,507 square feet, is required. The submitted landscape plan provides a worksheet indicating that this requirement will be addressed through the proposed planting of 4 deciduous columnar trees, 13 ornamental trees, 2 minor shade trees, 41 major shade trees, and 6 evergreen columnar trees on-site, for a total of 66 trees and 21,761 square feet of provided TCC. It is noted that the plant schedule shows a total of 69 trees provided; therefore, the plant schedule and TCC schedule shall be revised as necessary to show the correct number and types of proposed plantings. In addition, a complete TCC worksheet shall be provided in the correct format, signed and dated by a licensed landscape architect.

13. **Further Planning Board Findings and Comments from Other Entities:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:

a. **Community Planning—**

- (1) The 2013 Largo Town Center Sector Plan and SMA placed the development site within the Largo Town Center Northeast Quadrant area and mandated mid-rise mixed-use office and institutional development for the site.
- (2) The applicant requests six modifications to the development district standards of the Largo Town Center Sector Plan and SMA:
 - (a) **Build-To Line**—The proposed frontage setback exceeds the maximum 14 feet from the established build-to line (BTL) specified by the Largo Town Center D-D-O Zone development standards (page 138). The applicant states that security concerns make it impractical for surface parking to be set back 40 feet from the BTL as required by the

development standards (page 165). Given the unique security and design requirements of hotels, the requested amendment is appropriate and reasonable.

- (b) **Building Frontage**—The Largo Town Center development district standards (page 138) require new buildings within the northwest, northeast, or southeast quadrants to occupy 70-100 percent of the individual lot frontage or block length. The applicant requests a waiver from the standards because the required parking for the proposed hotel will restrict the maximum frontage of the building to be less than 50 percent of the lot frontage. The applicant also cited the distribution of 104-hotel rooms over five floors as another factor restricting the maximum frontage of the hotel. Based on these limitations, the applicant's request is supported.
- (c) **Parking Design**—The D-D-O Zone standards (page 165) prohibit parking between the front of the new building and the street or other public space. They also require surface or structured parking to be located mid-block or internally within the building site and screened from public view. Because of its unique nature and security requirements, it is not reasonable or practicable for a hotel use to meet the D-D-O Zone standards. In addition, the proposed use is not only permitted under the M-U-I Zone, but is a desirable use in this location in terms of potential hospitality services within walking distance of the planned regional medical center. Therefore, the applicant's request is supported.
- (d) **Sign Design**—The D-D-O Zone standard for monumental and freestanding signs (page 174) for buildings under 100,000 square feet of gross floor area limits such signs to 24 square feet. The applicant maintains that, given the width of the proposed hotel's frontage (248 feet), the 25-square-foot monumental sign proposed is the minimum size necessary for viewing from passing motor vehicles. The proposed sign is an appropriate scale and, therefore, the applicant's request is supported.
- (e) **Architectural Design**—The D-D-O Zone standard for fenestration (page 159) calls for a minimum of 15 percent of the building façade area to be door and window openings. The applicant acknowledges that the fenestration percentages for its ground and upper story façades fall short of the required minimum. The applicant requests relaxation of this standard on the grounds that the overall architectural details of the proposed use comply with the D-D-O Zone standards. Given the special nature of the proposed use, this request is reasonable and not likely to negatively impact the sector plan vision.

In addition, the proposed main building satisfies the requirement for a flat roof (page 163) and so there is no need for the applicant to request a modification to the applicable D-D-O Zone standard.

- b. **Transportation Planning**—The approved preliminary plan established a trip cap of 1,140 total peak-hour trips. Based on the number of occupied rooms, the proposed use will generate 55 AM and 58 PM peak-hour trips. The site was previously approved for an office building of 60,985 square feet which would have generated 122 AM and 113 PM peak-hour trips. The proposed use generates far fewer peak-hour trips and will have less impact on surrounding roadways than the previously approved office use.

Access will be provided from two right-in/right-out driveways on Lottsford Road. Two way circulation will be provided on-site. This is acceptable.

The site is adjacent to Lottsford Road which is listed in the 2013 Largo Town Center Sector Plan and SMA as an arterial roadway. No development is proposed in the right-of-way of Lottsford Road.

Conclusion

Overall, from the standpoint of transportation, it is determined that this plan is acceptable and meets the required findings for a detailed site plan as described in Section 27-285 of the Zoning Ordinance.

- c. **Trails**—

- (1) The Complete Streets section of the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* (MPOT) includes the following policies regarding sidewalk construction and the accommodation of pedestrians.

POLICY 1: Provide standard sidewalks along both sides of all new road construction within the Developed and Developing Tiers.

POLICY 2: All road frontage improvements and road capital improvement projects within the developed and Developing Tiers shall be designed to accommodate all modes of transportation. Continuous sidewalks and on-road bicycle facilities should be included to the extent feasible and practical.

The subject application is located on the east side of Lottsford Road in the Largo Town Center. Lottsford Road has an existing sidewalk along the frontage of the subject site. The submitted plans also reflect a sidewalk around the perimeter of the building and a sidewalk linking the building with the public right-of-way

(ROW) and sidewalk along Lottsford Road. The area master plan recommends designated bike lanes along Lottsford Road. This type of project cannot be implemented on a parcel by parcel basis, but can be considered and addressed by the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) at the time of road resurfacing and maintenance.

At that time, DPW&T can provide the appropriate bicycle treatment (such as designated bike lanes or shared lane markings) comprehensively for the entire road.

- (2) The sector plan recommends bicycle parking at structured parking and surface parking lot locations. A small amount of bicycle parking is recommended consistent with the Parking Design Criteria (page 165) below:

- 9. Bicycle parking should be provided in structured parking garages and surface parking lots based on a site-by-site needs basis. Appropriate location, number of racks, and level of access for each facility depends on the anticipated use of the site or building. Conformance to LEED or similar federal, state, and county bicycle parking criteria is strongly encouraged.**

A small amount of bicycle parking is provided for in Condition 1(d) below. Conformance with leadership in energy and environmental design (LEED) or similar federal, state, and county bicycle parking criteria is strongly encouraged. The type and location of the bicycle parking should be labeled on the DSP prior to certification of the DSP. A condition is included in the approval of the application addressing this issue.

d. Subdivision Review—

- (1) The subject property is located on Tax Map 67 in Grid E-1. The site is known as Lot 27 which is the subject of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (PPS) 4-82133 and recorded in Plat Book NLP 122 at Plat 25.
- (2) The overall PPS 4-82133 contained 15 lots totaling 82.7 acres, which at the time was zoned I-3. The property was estimated to have the potential to yield 1.08 million square feet of gross floor area (GFA) and generate 1,140 peak-hour trips. Any development above that will require a new PPS.
- (3) Detailed Site Plan DSP-15041 is in substantial conformance with the approved PPS and record plat if the above comments are addressed. The bearings, distances, lots, and blocks as reflected on the final plats must be shown and match DSP-15041. Failure of the site plan and record plat to match will result in the permits being placed on hold until the plans are corrected.

- e. **Permit Review**—There were no permit review comments on this application.
- f. **Environmental Planning**—The Planning Board reviewed the following analysis of the subject application:
 - (1) The subject site fronts on Lottsford Road, a master planned arterial roadway that is regulated with respect to traffic generated noise. No scenic or historic roadways are located within the vicinity of the site. The site is located within the Southwest Branch watershed of the Patuxent River basin. No steep slopes occur on the property. The predominant soils found to occur according to the US Department of Agriculture (USDA), Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), Web Soil Survey (WSS) include the Collington-Wist Complex and the Urban-Land-Collington-Wist complex. Marlboro clay and Christiana complexes are not mapped on this property. According to information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Natural (DNR) Heritage Program, there are no rare, threatened, or endangered species found to occur on the subject property. The site is located in the Environmental Strategy Area 1 (ESA 1) of *Plan Prince George's 2035 Approved General Plan* (Plan Prince George's 2035) (formerly the Developed Tier). According to the 2005 *Approved Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan*, the site contains no Regulated Areas, Evaluation Areas or Network Gaps.
 - (2) The project is grandfathered with respect to the environmental regulations contained in Subtitles 24, 25 and 27 that came into effect on September 1, 2010, because the project has a previously approved preliminary plan (4-82133).
 - (3) An approved Natural Resources Inventory Equivalency Letter (NRI-032-16) was submitted with the application, which was approved on February 12, 2016. No revisions are required for conformance with the NRI.
 - (4) This site does not contain any regulated environmental features that are required to be protected under Section 27-285(b)(4) of the Zoning Regulations.
 - (5) An approved stormwater management concept plan and approval letter have been submitted (327-2005-01). The approval includes the use of a hydrodynamic separator to meet water quality. Water quantity is to be addressed by the use of a pre-existing regional facility. There is an overall reduction in impervious area; from 2.02 to 1.70 acres. No additional information is required with regard to stormwater management.
- g. **Historic Preservation**—The subject application will have no effect on identified historic sites, resources, districts, or known archeological sites.

- h. **Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE)**—In a memorandum dated August 31, 2016, DPIE provided standard comments regarding right-of-way improvements, utilities, and stormwater management. An access study to determine the adequacy of access points and the need for acceleration/ deceleration, turning, and by-pass lanes is required.
- i. **Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA)**—In an e-mail received on July 6, 2016, SHA indicated that any work in SHA right-of-way will require a SHA plan review, approval, and permit issuance as necessary. The current access to the site is via a County-owned road. Any off-site improvements on SHA roads, if mandated, will need to be coordinated with the SHA District 3 Access Management Section.
- j. **Prince George's County Police Department**—The Police Department did not offer comments on the subject application.
- k. **Prince George's County Health Department**—In a memorandum dated July 22, 2016, the Environmental Engineering Program of the Health Department offered the following comments and recommendations:
 - (1) The applicant must submit plans for the proposed food facility and swimming pool and apply to obtain a Health Department permits through the Department of Permitting, Inspections & Enforcement (DPIE).

The applicant has been made aware of this comment.

- (2) If pets shall be allowed at these extended stay accommodations, consider including in the design "pet friendly" amenities for pets and their owners in designated open space areas. The areas may consist of the appropriate safe playing grounds, signage, and fencing. Pet refuse disposal stations and water sources are recommended.

Pets will not be allowed at the hotel.

- (3) During the construction 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.

A condition is included in the approval of this application that addresses this comment.

- (4) No construction 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.

A condition is included in the approval of this application that addresses this comment.

- l. **Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)**—WSSC did not offer comments on the subject application.
 - m. **Washington Gas**—Washington Gas did not offer comments on the subject application.
 - n. **Verizon**—Verizon did not offer comments on the subject application.
 - o. **Potomac Electric Power Company (PEPCO)**—PEPCO did not offer comments on the subject application.
 - p. **Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department**—The Fire/EMS Department did not offer comments on the subject application.
 - q. **City of Glenarden**—The City of Glenarden did not offer comments on the subject application.
14. As required by Section 27-285(b)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance, the detailed site plan will, if approved with the conditions recommended below, represent 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.
15. 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.**

As there are no regulated environmental features found on the subject property, no preservation or restoration is necessary.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Subtitle 27 of the Prince George's County Code, the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission adopted the findings contained herein and APPROVED Detailed Site Plan DSP-15041 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

- A. The Planning Board APPROVED the alternative development district standards for:
- 1. **Urban Design Criteria/Build-to Line (page 135):** To permit a build-to-line (BTL) of 122 feet.

2. **Urban Design Criteria/Frontage (page 138):** To permit building frontage occupancy of 48 percent.
 3. **Parking Design Criteria/ Surface Parking Lots and Structured Parking Garages (page 165):** To allow the surface parking design as proposed on the plan (no blocks are proposed).
 4. **Parking Design Criteria/ Surface Parking Lots and Structured Parking Garages (page 165):** To allow the approximate 15-foot setback for the surface parking area as proposed on the plan.
 5. **Signage Design Criteria/Freestanding and Monument Signs (pages 173–174):** To allow a monument sign of 25 square feet in area and six feet in height in conjunction with a building under 100,000 square feet.
 6. **Architectural Design Criteria/Building Form (Page 159):** To allow the percentage of fenestration (between 12 and 13 percent for most elevations and two percent for the upper floor north elevation) as shown in the approved elevations.
- B. The Planning Board APPROVED the Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII-085-05-01) and further APPROVED Detailed Site Plan DSP-15041 for Staybridge Suites at Largo, subject to the following conditions:
1. Prior to certification, the detailed site plan (DSP) shall be revised, or additional information shall be provided, as follows:
 - a. Revise the plan view on Sheet C4.0 to reflect the correct number of proposed hotel rooms.
 - b. Clarify on the sign detail sheet that the individual letters will be internally lit and include the Development District Overlay Zone calculation and allowable/ proposed square footages for the entire sign area.
 - c. Delete Note 8 on the plan coversheet regarding the reference to the Developed Tier and Note 11 indicating the existing use.
 - d. Provide a bicycle rack(s) accommodating a minimum of five bicycle parking spaces at a location close to the building entrance. The location and type of racks shall be included on the DSP.
 - e. Provide color interior courtyard elevations.

- f. Provide site plan notes as follows:
- (1) During the demolition/construction phases of this project, no dust shall 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.
 - (2) During the demolition/construction phases of this project, the applicant shall conform to the construction activity noise control requirements as specified in the Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR).
- g. The Type II tree conservation plan (TCP II) shall be revised as follows:
- (1) The approval block shall be updated to include the assigned TCP number (TCP II-085-05) and the assigned Development Review Division case number (DSP-15041).
 - (2) Update the woodland conservation worksheet to reflect all areas and calculations as previously approved. Reflect the current zoning.
 - (3) Add the standard hazardous tree note "i" under Tree Preservation and Retention Notes, per the Environmental Technical Manual.
 - (4) Move the TCP notes to the detail sheet.
 - (5) Enlarge the worksheet so that it is legible.
 - (6) Revise the plan and legend to reflect the standard symbols per the Environmental Technical Manual. Enlarge the symbols to ensure they are legible. The symbols shown in the legend shall reflect the line type scale shown on the plan.
 - (7) Add the standard tree pruning detail.
 - (8) Have the qualified professional who prepared the plan sign, date, and update the revision box with a summary of the revision.
- h. The following revisions shall be made to the landscape plan:
- (1) The schedule for Section 4.2 shall be deleted.

- (2) A label for the Section 4.3.1 bufferyard and the bufferyard width shall be provided on the plan. The existing tree credited in the schedule shall be labeled on the plan with the species and caliper.
- (3) Show the required amount of plantings within the interior parking area in accordance with the 4.3.2 schedule.
- (4) Indicate the ownership, zoning, and uses of the adjacent properties.
- (5) The Section 4.9 schedule and Plant Schedule shall indicate the same number and type of plant material proposed.
- (6) The Plant Schedule and Tree Canopy Coverage schedule shall show the correct number and types of plantings proposed.
- (7) A complete Tree Canopy Coverage worksheet shall be provided in the correct format, signed and dated by a licensed landscape architect.

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

* * * * *

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the action taken by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner Washington, seconded by Commissioner Bailey, with Commissioners Washington, Bailey, Geraldo, and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, September 22, 2016, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 13th day of October 2016.

Patricia Colihan Barney
Executive Director

By 
Jessica Jones
Planning Board Administrator

PCB:JJ:CF:rpg

APPROVED AS TO LEGAL SUFFICIENCY

M-NCPG Legal Department
Date 9/30/16