

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 December 14, 2017, regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-17003 for BA/WRPR College Park, LLC, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The subject application in this case is for the development of 393 multifamily residential units and 78,669 square feet of ground-floor commercial space, including an existing 5,698-square-foot restaurant.
2. **Development Data Summary:**

	EXISTING	APPROVED
Zone(s)	M-U-I/D-D-O	M-U-I/D-D-O
Use(s)	Restaurant	Multifamily Residential/ Commercial/Restaurant
Acreage	5.82	5.82
Parcels	4	5
Lots	0	0
Square Footage/GFA	5,698 (to remain)	78,669 (72,971 new)
Dwelling Units	0	393

OTHER DEVELOPMENT DATA

	REQUIRED	APPROVED
Retail–3 Spaces/1,000 sq. ft.	Retail–72,971 sq. ft.=219 Spaces	691–Garage
PARKING	Residential–393 Units=393 Spaces	17–On-Street
	Restaurant (Retail)–approx. 5,700 sq. ft. =18 Spaces	61–Applebee’s Restaurant
	630 Spaces Required	769 Spaces Proposed
Bicycle Parking (1 Space Per 3 Vehicle Spaces)	210	TBD (Amendment Granted*)
Min. Parking Space Dimension (Angled Parking)	9 1/2' X 19'	9 1/2' X 19' 8' X 10' (ADA SPACES)

	REQUIRED	APPROVED
Minimum Parking Space Dimension (Parallel Parking)	8' X 22'	8' X 22'
Drive Aisle Widths	22' for two-way traffic with perpendicular parking 30' with two-way traffic (DPIE) 20' with two-way traffic (SHA)	22 feet minimum entrance widths 22' (Hartwick Rd–DPIE) 22' (Guilford Dr–DPIE) 22' (Baltimore Ave–SHA)
LANDSCAPING–PARKING FACILITIES	1 Island per 10 parking spaces (on average); additionally, there shall be no more than two (2) contiguous parking bays with a minimum nine (9) foot wide island separation the bays from additional bays or aisles	Island per 10 parking spaces (on average) provided with no more than two (2) contiguous parking bays
LOADING		
Off-Street Loading Space(s) Minimum (One (1) Space for area between 2,000 to 10,000 sq. ft. of GFA + One (1) for area between 10,000 to 100,000 sq. ft. of GFA):	2	4
REGULATIONS		
Principal Building Height	6 Stories Max, 2 Min	6 Stories
Front Build-to-Line (BTL) Principal	0'-10'	>10' (Amendment Granted*)
Front BTL Secondary	0'-12'	0'-12'
Side Setback	0'-24'	>24' (Amendment Granted*)
Rear Setback	10'	N/A
Frontage Buildout	80% Min at BTL	Hartwick Road - 48.7% Guilford Drive - 43.8% Baltimore Avenue - 0% (Amendment Granted*)
Lot Coverage	80% Max	94.23% (Amendment Granted*)

Note: *See discussion in Finding 7 below.

3. **Location:** The subject site is located on the western side of US 1 (Baltimore Avenue), and is bounded to the north by Hartwick Road, to the east by US 1, and to the southwest by Guilford Drive. The subject property is also located in Planning Area 66 and in Council District 3, within the City of College Park.
4. **Surrounding Uses:** The subject property is located on the western side of US 1, with commercial land uses in the Mixed Use-Infill (M-U-I) Zone beyond; to the southwest by Guilford Drive, with residential land use in the M-U-I Zone beyond; to the west by commercial land uses in the M-U-I Zone; and to the north by Hartwick Road, with commercial land uses in the M-U-I Zone beyond.

5. **Previous Approvals:** The property includes parcels which are the subject of record plats, but has not been the subject of any prior site plan approvals. The site has an approved Natural Resources Inventory (NRI) Equivalency Letter, NRI-28-2017, approved on February 2, 2017, which is valid until February 2, 2020. The property is also the subject of Stormwater Management Concept Plan 37395-2017-00, approved on August 25, 2017 and valid until August 25, 2020.

6. **Design Features:**

Site Design—Two six-story buildings are herein approved to be built on the southern portion of the site (Buildings 1 and 2) and will be connected by an elevated pedestrian bridge. The buildings are a vertical mixed-use, with ground-floor retail, and with multifamily units above. Parking is provided in two structured parking garages, a surface parking lot to the west of the restaurant, and limited on-street parking on the road extending into the site opposite Calvert Road. The first structured parking garage is six-tiered, located in Building 1, with one level below grade. The garage is interior, will be wrapped with residential apartments, and will be generally screened from primary and secondary street frontages. The second structured parking garage is located in Building 2, which has ground-floor retail along its primary street frontages, and is partially screened from Guilford Drive.

The main access to the project will be from US 1. Secondary access will be from two access points along Hartwick Road and three along Guilford Drive. On-site circulation consists of a new east-west private street starting at US 1, opposite Calvert Road, and connecting to Guilford Drive. There are also two north-south roadways proposed to connect Hartwick Road to Guilford Drive, one along the western edge and one central to the site. Loading is shown on-site adjacent to Guilford Drive. There is an additional curb cut herein approved on US 1.

On-site access and circulation was evaluated with the preliminary plan of subdivision (PPS) and again with the detailed site plan (DSP), and found acceptable.

Architecture—Architecture for the project is classic in its simplicity and includes use of a variety of quality masonry materials including decorative face concrete, cast stone, and cementitious panel. The masonry products are accented with metal panels and coping, some wood siding, vinyl windows, and an aluminum storefront system for the first story commercial façade. Windows and balconies are banded, providing horizontal balance to the high-rise nature of the buildings. Colors of gray and red predominate, though other neutral colors are utilized as accents and complement the predominant color scheme.

Recreational Facilities—Recreational facilities for the project are provided on-site and include the following:

- Fitness room
- Yoga/Multipurpose room
- Two pools
- Four seasons lawn with barbeque facilities

Two passive recreational lounges (bridge lounge and aqua lounge)
Demonstration kitchen
Passive recreational lobbies (residential entrance and north elevator)
Cabanas
Game room

Bonding for these facilities and the requirement for a recreational facilities agreement is conditioned as a part of the PPS recommendations.

Signage—The Planning Board herein approves a sign package for the project, which shows 160 signs in the following 12 separate categories:

Project/Tenant monument
Entrance Monument
Entrance Tenant Monument
Anchor Tenant Blade ID
Retail/Restaurant Tenant ID
Retail/Restaurant Tenant Blade
Project Site Directory
Project Site Directional—Vehicular
Project Site Directional—Pedestrian
Project Site Directional—Wall Mounted
Residential ID Sign
Primary Residential Entry
Secondary Residential Entry
Graphic Panels on Glass
Graphic Panels on Building
Loading Dock Identity
Back of House Plaque
Parking Garage Entrance ID Blade
Parking Garage Entrance ID
Leasing Banner

The submitted sign plan for the project included square footage, but not all details necessary to fully evaluate conformance with the sign requirements of the sector plan. A single sign type, specified as the “building-mounted blade sign, vehicular scale” exceeds the stipulated nine-square-foot maximum. See Finding 7 for a discussion of the needed amendment to the sector plan. A condition of this approval requires that, prior to certificate approval, the applicant provide scaled details of all the signs and elevation drawings showing their location on the façades in conformance with the sign requirements of the sector plan.

Site Details—Site details on the landscape plan include various paving types, trash receptacles, planters, benches, tables and chairs, and bike racks. All details are herein approved as aesthetic and attractive choices for the subject project.

Green Building Techniques—The 2010 *Approved Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and SMA) requires the project to be LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) certified at a minimum of the “Silver” level. The applicant has provided a LEED score card demonstrating that green building techniques may be utilized in the project to qualify it for LEED “Silver” certification. A combination of green building techniques employed in subject areas include location and transportation, water efficiency, energy and atmosphere, materials and resources, and indoor environmental quality. LEED certification does not occur until after a building is constructed and in use for at least one year. Therefore, upon LEED certification, the applicant should submit documentation to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) demonstrating a minimum of the “Silver” level LEED certification.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **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 Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and SMA provides a clear vision for the future transformation of the US 1 corridor from an auto-dominated roadway, into a series of vibrant, transit-oriented, walkable nodes. The sector plan addressed development and market changes that have taken place, and sets the stage for the continued evolution of an exemplary college town.

One of the implementation tools set forth in the plan are development district standards (page 227), which contain regulations that impact the design and character of the Central US 1 Corridor. The stated purpose of these standards in the plan is to shape high-quality public spaces with buildings and other physical features, and to create a strong sense of place for College Park and the University of Maryland, consistent with the land use and urban design recommendations of the sector plan.

	Standard	Required	Approved
1	Frontage Build-Out	80 percent	US 1–63 percent, due to the existing Applebee’s Restaurant, which will develop at a later time Guilford Drive–52 percent
2	Lot Coverage	80 percent maximum	81.98 percent
3	Primary Building Setback	10-foot maximum	12-feet
4	Parking Spaces	630	769
5	Loading Space Setback	30-foot minimum from public sidewalk	25 feet from public sidewalk
6	Public Access Intervals	No greater than 50-feet between entrances to retail stores	Greater than 50-feet to accommodate a larger anchor tenant
7	Siding	Horizontal Lap Siding (Hardiplank)	Metal wall panels and cementitious panels
8	Pedestrian Light Fixtures	Not taller than 15-feet	18-feet high when located on the internal streets
9	Loading Spaces	2 maximum	4
10	Setbacks-Guilford Drive	Front secondary 12-foot build-to-line	Variable build-to-line
11	Setbacks-Hartwick Drive	Front secondary 12-foot build-to-line	Variable build-to-line
12	Streetscape on westernmost street	Planters and on-street parking	Planters and on-street parking to be provided when abutting property redevelops
13	Signage	Not larger than 9 square feet	120 square feet

Section 27-548.25(c) of the Zoning Ordinance states the following:

If the applicant so requests, the Planning Board may apply development standards which differ from the Development District Standards, most recently approved or amended by the District Council, unless the Sectional Map Amendment text specifically provides otherwise. The Planning Board shall find the alternate Development District Standards will benefit the development and the Development District and will not substantially impair implementation of the Master Plan, Master Plan Amendment, or Sector Plan.

The Planning Board herein approves the following modifications from the development district standards in Character Area 5A–Walkable Nodes (an * indicates the applicant did not request the modification, but it is needed):

- a. **Page 234—Minimum frontage buildout of 80 percent along US 1 (Baltimore Avenue) and Hartwick Road** (To allow the frontage build-out along US 1 to be 61 percent and the frontage buildout along Guilford Drive to be 52 percent)

This amendment is necessary due to practical considerations regarding the layout of the project, including the location of existing power lines along US 1, the existing Applebee’s Restaurant to remain, the interruption of the access points to the north-south travelways, and the proposed east-west private street along Guilford Drive. This amendment will benefit the development in that it will facilitate access to the project, internal circulation on the site, and allow for the development of a pedestrian-friendly plaza with ample seating, and stormwater management as a feature, activating the space and thereby meeting the intent of the sector plan. This reduction is necessary due to the retention of the existing Applebee’s Restaurant at the intersection of Hartwick Road and US 1, which is to remain. In redevelopment, the front build-out requirement should be met on the Applebee’s Restaurant site.

- b. **Page 242—Lot coverage a maximum of 80 percent**
(To allow the lot coverage to be 81.98 percent)

The amendment for lot coverage is minimal (1.98 percent above the requirement) and will benefit the development by allowing the travelways necessary to provide the internal circulation necessary on the site, as well as the amenity provided in the pedestrian plaza on the western end of the private street. As the deviation from the requirement is minor, it will not substantially impair the implementation of the sector plan.

- c. **Page 234—Primary building setback is a maximum of 10 feet**
(To allow the primary building setback to be 12 feet)

This amendment is necessary due to the required setback from the existing powerlines along US 1. It will benefit the development by allowing it to go forward, despite this existing condition. Note that all other primary and secondary frontages will be built within the prescribed setback minimums and maximums. Therefore, the project will generally implement the sector plan in this respect.

- d. **Page 239—Parking/Number of Spaces: 630 parking spaces shall be provided for the project** (To allow the applicant to provide 769 parking spaces)

The sector plan is unusual, in this respect, in requiring an exact number of parking spaces (as opposed to a minimum or maximum) and requires that any deviation from the number, either more or less, requires an amendment from the development district standards (page 239). The requested amendment will not impair the implementation of the sector plan, as it will ensure that the development will be adequately parked for residents and visitors, and is successful as a mixed-use development. Note that the majority of the parking will be structured, and so will not visually impinge on the development, and will help implement the sector plan's goal for this character area of creating a walkable node of higher-density mixed-use buildings that accommodate apartments with nonresidential land use on the first story.

The sector plan requires and only allows, one parking space for each residential unit, and three spaces per 1,000 square feet of commercial space. Therefore, the 393 multifamily units require 393 parking spaces, and the 78,669 square feet of commercial space requires 237 parking spaces, for a total of 630 parking spaces required. A total of 769 parking spaces are provided. This amendment is required by the sector plan, as it states that any deviation from the parking requirements requires a modification of the development district standards (page 239). The Planning Board herein grants this requested amendment.

- e. **Page 242—Loading Space Setback: Loading spaces must be 30-foot minimum from a sidewalk** (To allow loading 25 feet from a sidewalk)

This amendment benefits the development in that it provides needed loading space for the project primarily for, and proximate to, the retail portion of this development. The majority of ground-level service and loading for both buildings is internal and, therefore, not subject to this requirement. The amendment herein granted does not hamper implementation of the sector plan, as the degree of the amendment is minimal (five feet), and the loading space will be screened from public view with an overhead coiling door that will be closed at all times when vehicles are not loading.

- f. **Page 246—No greater than 50 feet between entrances** (To allow more than 50 feet between entrance to retail stores)

This amendment benefits the development in that it would be undesirable for larger anchor tenants to have 50 feet or less between entrances. Note that implementation of the sector plan, however, will not be impaired as the in-line retail areas will provide entrances spaced 50 feet or less, and all tenants will be required to comply with all other design criteria included in the sector plan for façades and shopfronts.

- g. **Page 251—Use Horizontal Lap Siding Hardiplank** (To allow use of metal wall panels and cementitious panels)

This amendment will benefit the development as it will enable the applicant to utilize metal wall panels and cementitious panels in accordance with a slightly different design aesthetic for the first story of the project. The project complies with this standard in the majority of the architecture for this project in that variations on conventional horizontal lap siding and vertical board and batten are proposed for all of levels 2–6, in accordance with this development standard. This amendment to development district standards will not impair the implementation of the sector plan, as the majority of the architecture complies, and the cementitious panels herein approved, are a quality material similar to the hardiplank otherwise required.

- h. **Page 266—Pedestrian Light Fixtures shall not be taller than 15 feet** (To allow an 18-foot-high pedestrian light fixture when located on the internal streets)

The development will benefit from this amendment by providing adequate lighting to the site. Granting the amendment herein, will not impair the implementation of the sector plan, as the difference of three feet in height is minimal and will have very minor impact on the overall views of the project, and will reduce the visual clutter within the internal streetscape by requiring fewer lights to meet photometric goals.

- i. **Loading Spaces—Two are required** (To allow the applicant to provide four)

The development will benefit from the inclusion of four loading spaces due to the unique configuration and topography of the site, and will enable adequate loading for the different uses on the site. Granting the amendment from this requirement does not impair the implementation of the

sector plan, as the loading spaces are well screened from view, so the loading function will not create negative impacts on the surrounding area.

j. **Page 235—Setbacks Front secondary 12-foot build-to line (To allow a variable build to line along Guilford Drive)**

A variable build-to-line along Guilford Drive is necessary to accommodate the varied form and massing of the architecture and to provide for necessary site elements such as stormwater management facilities and clear sight lines at the access points of the development. The requested relief from compliance with this development district standard is minimal, and the street wall will still generally be created. Granting this amendment does not impair the implementation of the sector plan as the desired street wall is generally provided. It will benefit the development in providing additional visual interest in the architecture and items, such as clear lines of sight at the access points to the development and stormwater management facilities.

k. **Page 235—Setbacks Front secondary 12-foot build-to line (To allow a variable build to line along Hartwick Drive)**

A variable build-to-line along this frontage is necessary to accommodate the existing Applebee's Restaurant parking lot on Hartwick Drive. Note that the project meets this requirement on the western portion of the street frontage, but departs from it along the Applebee's Restaurant parking lot on its eastern end. Per the applicant, this portion of the site will be redeveloped in the future and will come into conformance with this development district standard at that time. Granting this amendment does not impair the implementation of the sector plan as it is an interim measure, and final development on the site will be required to meet the requirement. This amendment to development district standards benefits the development by permitting it to go forward at the present time, with an eye to future conformance with the requirement when the Applebee's Restaurant is redeveloped.

l. **Page 263—Streetscape (to allow the frontage of the proposed street on the west side of the site to not have individual or continuous planters, with parking on one or both sides)**

The subject street is shown as a north/south travelway on page 81 of the sector plan. The applicant has agreed to dedicate a 25-foot-wide strip of land, with the expectation that, when the property located immediately to the west of the subject site develops, an additional 25-foot-wide strip will be dedicated, providing a 50-foot-wide street. Streetscape improvements, in the Walkable Node Character Area are required, in addition to having raised curbs drained by inlets and sidewalks (which the applicant shows), to have individual or continuous planters with parking on one or both sides, which is not shown. This amendment to development district standards does not impair the implementation of the sector plan as it is an interim measure. The project is exempt from the street tree requirement due to the street's width, which is less than 40 feet, but street trees will be required when the adjacent property is redeveloped.

- m. **Page 254 Signage (to allow the two blade signs along US 1 at Guilford Drive and the exit just south of the Applebee's Restaurant to measure in excess of nine square feet).**

Two blade signs measuring 120 square feet, well in excess of the nine square feet specified for blade signs, are included in the project. One is located at the intersection of US 1 and Guilford Drive, and the other is located at the intersection of the secondary US 1 access point located just south of the Applebee's Restaurant. These signs need to be larger for visibility from passing automobiles. Also, as the building massing is large and the height of the building approximately 75 feet, the larger signs will be a more proportional fit. Granting this amendment benefits the development by providing identification signage for the development and will not impair implementation of the Sector Plan.

Architectural Elements/Landmark Features (page 253)

The Planning Board herein finds that an amendment is not necessary for the proposed architectural element/landmark feature.

The sector plan designates six landmark locations along the US 1 corridor from just south of Guilford Drive, extending north of I-95. These six locations for landmark features "should be designed in response to the prominence and visibility of their sites." A landmark feature can be an architectural element such as a tower or a lantern, which are described on page 253 of the sector plan, which includes pictures that reflect a more classic architectural form. The architecture approved with this application is of a more modern style. The applicant has proposed a five-story bay window element that does not fully meet the requirement for a prominent and highly visible feature at this designated landmark location. This feature should be more distinct from the building, and reflect the prominence of the first feature at the edge of the southern boundary to the US 1 Corridor. The applicant could provide a feature that would compliment the current architecture or include public art at this location. A condition of this approval requires that, prior to certificate approval, the five-story glass bay window located on Building 2 at the corner of Guilford Drive and US 1, be modified to create a more distinctive landmark feature or the addition of public art to the project at this location.

8. **Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance:** The DSP approval has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements of the M-U-I Zone; Airport Compatibility, Part 10B; and the requirements of the D-D-O Zone.

- a. Section 27-546.19(c), Site Plans for Mixed Uses, 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;**

The site plan meets the site design guidelines and development district standards of the Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and SMA, except those that the Planning Board has granted amendments to herein, 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**

The approval is for a mixture of multifamily residential and commercial/retail uses in a vertical mixed-use format, in several large buildings in a complex fronting on US 1, and bounded to the north by Hartwick Road and to the south by Guilford Drive. The residential and commercial retail use are intended to serve students and residents of College Park, as well as visitors to the area. The parking provided for the project will be available to both project residents and visitors to the commercial retail establishments on the ground floor of the buildings. The developer has designed each of the components of the development to be compatible internally and externally. Architectural compatibility with the residential land use on the opposite side of Guilford Drive is provided by the architecture in the buildings facing the residential area.

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

The site plan provides locations for pedestrian street lights, building-mounted, and other lighting on-site, along with a photometric plan. A condition of this approval ensures 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;**

The main building materials herein approved are quality masonry materials such as brick, cementitious panel, cast stone, and decorative-face concrete. Color accents are in gray and red. These building materials and colors are similar to those on other mixed-use developments in the surrounding neighborhood and are, therefore, compatible with the architecture of the surrounding area.

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

The DSP does not involve any outdoor storage areas, and all the mechanical equipment herein approved will be internal or located on the roof. Therefore, these areas will have minimum visibility from adjacent properties and public streets in accordance with this requirement.

- (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**

A condition of this approval ensures that the signs conform to the applicable development district standards, except the standard regarding the maximum square footage of blade signs. Regarding that requirement, an amendment to development district standards has been granted. See Finding 7 for a discussion of that amendment to development district standards.

- (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;

A condition of this approval requires the applicant to provide hours of operation and deliveries, demonstrating minimal impacts on adjacent properties in accordance with this requirement.

(ii) Location of activities with potential adverse impacts;

There are no activities on the site with potential adverse impacts. Therefore, this requirement is not applicable to the subject project.

(iii) Location and use of trash receptacles;

The trash receptacles herein approved are located internally to the site and have no adverse impact on adjacent properties.

(iv) Location of loading and delivery spaces;

Two loading spaces are herein approved on-site, one facing Guilford Drive and one internal to each building, for a total of four. On-site access and circulation has been evaluated and found acceptable by the Planning Board. In order to minimize impacts on the surrounding area from the loading activities, a condition of this approval requires the applicant to provide hours of operation and deliveries, demonstrating minimal impacts on adjacent properties.

(v) Light intensity and hours of illumination; and

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

(vi) Location and use of outdoor vending machines.

The subject DSP does not propose any outdoor vending machines.

- b. The subject approval is located within Aviation Policy Area (APA) 6 under the traffic pattern for the small general aviation airport, College Park Airport. 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.**

The heights of the five buildings included in the subject project exceed the building height restriction of APA-6. Therefore, a condition of this approval requires that, prior to certification of the DSP, the applicant shall provide proof of compliance with Federal Aviation Regulation (FAR) Part 77.

- c. 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 a DSP. Discussed in Finding 7 above, the Planning Board has granted 13 such amendments to the D-D-O Zone standards. The requested amendments to the development standards as discussed in Finding 7, would benefit the development district and would not substantially impair implementation of the Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and SMA.
9. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-17021:** Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-17021 was approved the same day as, but prior to, the subject DSP as is required by Section 27-270 of the Zoning Ordinance. To ensure that the subject DSP is in conformance with the requirements of PPS 4-17021, a condition of this approval requires that, prior to certificate approval of the subject DSP, it be brought into conformance with the requirements of the Planning Board's approval of PPS 4-17021.
10. **2010 Prince George's County Landscape Manual:** The approved Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and SMA states that Sections 4.2, 4.3, and 4.7 of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* (Landscape Manual) do not apply within the development district (page 226). Therefore, the development herein approved is only subject to the requirements of Sections 4.1, 4.4, 4.6, 4.9, and 4.10 of the Landscape Manual. Schedules have been provided for Sections 4.1 and 4.9. The Planning Board has reviewed the submitted plans against the requirements of the sections and found them to be in conformance with the requirements. Additionally, a review of the plans finds that the approval is in conformance with the requirements of Section 4.4, Screening Requirements.

11. **Prince George’s County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance:** A Standard Letter of Exemption (S-028-2017) from the requirements of the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance (WCO) has been issued for the subject property because the site contains less than 10,000 square feet of woodland. Therefore, the project is not subject to the requirements of the WCO.
12. **Prince George’s County Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance:** A ten percent tree canopy coverage (TCC) requirement applies to this M-U-I-zoned property per the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance. This amounts to approximately 0.58 acre, or 25,265 square feet, to be provided in TCC. The approved plans provide the correct schedule demonstrating conformance with the requirements of the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance.
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. **Historic Preservation and Archeological Review**—Aerial photographic imagery from 1938 shows non-extant structures on the subject property. This project is adjacent to University National Bank, a documented property (66-077). Several commercial buildings remain on the subject property, the most significant and substantial of which is the Quality Inn located at 7200 Baltimore Avenue. The documentation and preservation of historic sites and resources associated with the Mid-Century Modern movement is an initiative within the 2010 *Approved Historic Sites and Districts Plan*, and is reflected in the efforts of the Historic Preservation Section in surveying Mid-Century sites across Prince George’s County. The Quality Inn adjacent to the proposed construction was designed by Ronald Senseman, and erected in 1962. Senseman was a well-known architect in the Washington, D.C. area whose work included hospitals, schools, churches, hotels, and nursing homes. Given the distinctive architectural design of this building and the local significance of its architect, property owner approval to photographically document the Quality Inn on the subject property should be sought.

The subject property has been extensively graded and extensively disturbed over time. A search of current and historic photographs, topographic and historic maps, and locations of currently known archeological sites indicates that the probability of archeological sites within the subject property is low. This approval will not impact any known Prince George’s County historic sites, historic resources, or archeological resources.

The buildings located at 7200 Baltimore Avenue in College Park will be photographically documented by the Planning Board’s designee, prior to demolition or any grading.
 - b. **Community Planning**—Pursuant to Section 27-548.25(b) of the Zoning Ordinance, this DSP approval meets the applicable standards of the Central US 1 Corridor D-D-O Zone, with conditions or an amendment has been obtained.

Pursuant to Section 27-548.26(b)(2)(A) and (b)(5), the amendments to the Central US 1 Corridor D-D-O Zone herein approved conform with the purposes and recommendations for the development district, as stated in the Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and SMA.

General Plan: The subject property is located in the UMD East Campus (Local) Center. “Plan 2035 designates 26 Local Centers, which includes new Purple Line stations, as focal points for development and civic activity based on their access to transit or major highways. The plan contains recommendations for directing medium- to medium-high residential development, along with limited commercial uses, to these locations, rather than scattering them throughout the Established Communities. These centers are envisioned as supporting walkability, especially in their cores and where transit service is available” (page 19).

Master Plan: The 2010 Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and SMA locates the property within a Walkable Node Character Area. Walkable Nodes consist of “higher-density mixed-use buildings that accommodate retail, offices, row houses, and apartments with emphasis on nonresidential land uses, particularly on the ground level. It has fairly small blocks with wide sidewalks and buildings set close to the frontages” (page 228).

Aviation Policy Area/Military Installation Overlay (M-I-O) Zone: This approval is located within College Park Aviation Policy Area (APA) 6, Traffic Pattern Area. In APA-6, development densities and intensities are the same as in the underlying zone. Every approval shall demonstrate compliance with height restrictions in Subdivision 2-Aviation Policy Areas. No building permit may be approved for a structure higher than 50 feet, unless the applicant demonstrates compliance with FAR Part 77.

SMA/Zoning: The Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and SMA retained the subject property in the M-U-I Zone and superimposed a D-D-O Zone. For a discussion of the subject project’s conformance with the development district standards of the sector plan, see Finding 7.

Additional Information

The Quality Inn was constructed in 1961 as the Park University Motel, on the site of the Lord Calvert Hotel. It was designed by Ronald S. Senseman, FAIA (1912–2001) and Neil Greene, AIA (b. 1933). Senseman was a founding member of the Potomac Valley Chapter of the AIA and served as its first president. For many years, the motel’s quintessentially mid-century-modern accordion roof was a landmark along this section of the US 1 corridor. The roof and other character-defining features exist, but are concealed by later remodeling. To encourage development in accordance with the sector plan, its goal “Provide opportunities for effective integration of community history;” its policy “Incorporate opportunities to highlight and interpret the significance of the City of College Park;” and its strategy “Include publicly accessible interpretation of the history and significance of the area” (page 201), documenting the complex before it is demolished is requested.

- c. **Transportation Planning**—The site plan is generally a requirement for new development within the D-D-O Zone associated with the Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and SMA. This requirement addresses the various design standards specified within the D-D-O Zone. The sector plan also, as part of the Streets and Open Spaces standards, has a requirement for a determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities. This site is being concurrently reviewed with Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-17021, and the major findings of that analysis are contained herein. Adequate transportation facilities have been found with the PPS in accordance with Subtitle 24 of the Prince George’s County Code, including access and circulation, and again with this DSP.

As such, the PPS was not approved with transportation-related conditions that require follow-up during the review of the DSP. Because the adequacy determination is a requirement for a site plan within this D-D-O Zone, the various adequacy-related conditions on the PPS are repeated below. The table below summarizes trip generation in each peak hour that has been used for the analysis and for formulating the trip cap for the site:

Trip Generation Summary, DSP-17003, BA/WRPR College Park								
Land Use	Use Quantity	Metric	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
			In	Out	Tot	In	Out	Tot
Existing Hotel	169	rooms	53	37	90	52	49	101
Existing Diner	3,601	square feet	21	18	39	21	14	35
Existing Applebee’s Restaurant	5,698	square feet	4	0	4	34	22	56
Driveway Trips Generated by Existing Uses			78	55	133	107	85	192
Less Pass-By (43 percent AM/diner and PM/both)			-9	-8	-17	-24	-15	-39
Total Existing Trips			69	47	116	83	70	153
Hotel to be Razed	169	rooms	-53	-37	-90	-52	-49	-101
Diner to be Razed (net)	3,601	square feet	-12	-10	-22	-12	-8	-20
Proposed Apartments	393	residences	41	163	204	153	83	236
Proposed Retail (excludes existing Applebee’s Restaurant)	72,971	square feet	80	49	129	233	252	485
Less Pass-By (40 percent AM and PM)			-32	-20	-52	-93	-101	-194
Net New Trips Utilized in Analysis			24	145	169	229	177	406
Total Site Trips for DSP			93	192	285	312	247	559
Proposed Cap for 4-17021 (Existing Less Razed Plus New)					292			589

The traffic study did not include the existing Applebee's Restaurant on the site. This use is included within the limits of the PPS and the DSP and, even though it exists and is not to be razed as part of this approval, and does not figure into the analysis, it has been recognized as a part of the trip cap for the site.

The rates used are consistent with the "Transportation Review Guidelines, Part 1, 2012" (Guidelines). This trip generation will be used for the analysis and for formulating the trip cap for the site, and it is consistent with the approval analyzed under the PPS and presented on the site plan.

The traffic generated by the approved PPS would impact the following intersections, interchanges, and links in the transportation system:

- US 1 at Campus Drive
- US 1 at The Hotel at UMD
- US 1 at Rossborough Lane
- US 1 at Fraternity Row
- US 1 at College Avenue/Regents Drive
- US 1 at Knox Road
- US 1 at Hartwick Road
- US 1 at Calvert Road
- US 1 at Guilford Drive
- Guilford Drive at Rowalt Drive/site access

The approval is supported by a traffic study dated September 2017 using counts dated September 2016. The study was provided by the applicant and referred to the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA), the Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T), and the Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE). Comments from the County and SHA were not received. The findings outlined below are based upon a review of these materials and analyses conducted by the Planning Board, consistent with the Guidelines.

Existing Traffic

The subject property is located within Transportation Service Area (TSA) 1, as defined in the *Plan Prince George's 2035 Approved General Plan* (Plan Prince George's 2035). It is also within the D-D-O Zone associated with the Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and SMA. As such, the subject property is evaluated according to the following standards:

Links and signalized intersections: Level of Service (LOS) E, with intersections evaluated within an overall link for a peak-period level of service as identified in the sector plan and further described in the "Transportation Review Guidelines."

Unsignalized intersections: The procedure for unsignalized intersections is not a true test of adequacy, but rather an indicator that further operational studies need to be conducted. A three-part process is employed for two-way stop-controlled intersections: (a) vehicle delay is computed in all movements using *The Highway Capacity Manual* (Transportation Research Board) procedure; (b) the maximum approach volume on the minor streets is computed if delay exceeds 50 seconds, (c) if delay exceeds 50 seconds and at least one approach volume exceeds 100, the CLV is computed. Once the CLV exceeds 1,150 for either type of intersection, this is deemed to be an unacceptable operating condition at unsignalized intersections. In response to such a finding, the Planning Board has generally recommended that the applicant provide a traffic signal warrant study and install the signal (or other less costly warranted traffic controls) if deemed warranted by the appropriate operating agency.

The critical intersections, interchanges, and links identified above are evaluated using counts taken in September 2016 and existing lane configurations.

Background traffic has been developed for the study area using the approved, but unbuilt, developments in the area. A 1.0 percent annual growth rate for a period of six years has been assumed.

TOTAL TRAFFIC CONDITIONS				
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)		Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)	
US 1 at Campus Drive	1,138	1,349	B	D
US 1 at The Hotel at U of MD	851	1,177	A	C
US 1 at Rossborough Lane	803	1,060	A	B
US 1 at Fraternity Row	704	870	A	A
US 1 at College Avenue/Regents Drive	839	1,129	A	B
US 1 at Knox Road	802	1,217	A	C
US 1 at Hartwick Road (as exists)				
Maximum Vehicle Delay (in seconds)	+999	+999	No Pass	No Pass
Approach Volume	94	133	Pass	No Pass
Critical Lane Volume	727	909	Pass	Pass
US 1 at Hartwick Road (with signalization)	727	909	A	A
US 1 at Calvert Road	663	1,025	A	B
US 1 at Guilford Drive	771	962	A	A
**Guilford Drive at Rowalt/site access	11.3*	13.0*	--	--
Link Peak-Period Level of Service (without Hartwick signalization)	808	1,074	A	B
Link Peak-Period Level of Service (with Hartwick signalization)	811	1,078	A	B
*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According to the Guidelines, delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Values shown as "+999" suggest that the parameters are beyond the normal range of the procedure, and should be interpreted as a severe inadequacy.				
**Not included in the peak-period link level of service.				

US 1 at Hartwick Road: The approval requires signalization at US 1 and Hartwick Road for the following two reasons:

- (1) The intersection was channelized several years ago to restrict the side street approaches to right turns. The intersection was signalized to accommodate the heavy pedestrian volumes crossing US 1. The existing pedestrian signals create a driver expectancy issue, in that they are special pedestrian activated signals that only activate when pre-empted by pedestrians. The intersection has already been shown to satisfy the pedestrian signal warrants based on the existing pedestrian signals. It is required that the intersection be modified to a fully-operational full-movement traffic signal, unless modified by the operating agency.
- (2) The approval of the full-movement signalized intersection at US 1 and Hartwick Road will directly benefit the intersection of US 1 and Calvert Road by improving the service level at that intersection by nearly 10 percent in the evening peak hour.

All critical intersections operate acceptably under total traffic in both peak hours. Additionally, the applicant proffered the signalization at US 1 and Hartwick Road, and partially for that reason this recommendation is carried forward as a condition of this approval.

A trip cap consistent with the trip generation assumed for the site was placed on the underlying PPS. The access and circulation patterns were reviewed during the PPS review. The configuration shown on the site plan is largely consistent with the pattern that was previously presented, and access and circulation are determined to be acceptable.

US 1 (Baltimore Avenue) is a major collector with a planned right-of-way of 88 to 112 feet. Further review of the D-D-O Zone standards indicates that a typical right-of-way of 97 feet is required to meet the plan recommendations between College Avenue and Guilford Drive. A review of the plats for the existing lots that are adjacent to US 1 indicates that 50 feet from centerline has already been dedicated from these properties along US 1. Therefore, it is determined that no further right-of-way dedication is required as part of this approval.

Nevertheless, the plan should be modified to show a dimension for the right-of-way or otherwise reference SHA right-of-way plats.

Conclusion

Overall, from the standpoint of transportation, it is determined that this plan is acceptable and meets the finding required for a DSP, as described in the Zoning Ordinance. In response to the adequacy of transportation facilities standard contained in the D-D-O Zone associated with the Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and SMA, the following has been made a condition of this approval:

- (1) Prior to issuance of the first building permit within the subject property, the applicant shall submit an acceptable traffic signal warrant study to SHA for signalization at the intersection of US 1 and Hartwick Road. The applicant should utilize a new 12-hour count, and should analyze signal warrants under total future traffic, as well as existing traffic, at the direction of SHA. If a signal or other traffic control improvements are deemed warranted at that time, the applicant shall bond the signal with SHA prior to release of any building permits within the subject property, and install it at a time when directed by SHA.
- d. **Subdivision**—The subject property is located on Tax Map 33 in Grid C-4 and is zoned M-U-I within the D-D-O Zone, subject to the Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and SMA. The site is currently known as Parcel C (1.95 acres) of College Park Shopping Center recorded in Plat Book VJ 164-66; Parcel C-1 (0.26 acre) of Seidenspinner Center recorded in Plat Book WWW 43-94; and Part of Parcels B–D as described in a deed recorded among the Prince George’s County Land Records in Liber 7602 folio 259. The property is the subject of PPS 4-17021, which was approved by the Planning Board concurrently with this approval.

The PPS and the subject DSP approve redevelopment of the site for 393 multifamily dwelling units, approximately 80,000 square feet of new commercial uses, 5,698 square feet of existing commercial to be retained, and associated parking facilities. Any revisions being made to the PPS shall, by condition of this approval, also be made to the DSP.

Plan Comments

- (1) The existing property information provided on the DSP shall, by condition of this approval, be revised to be consistent with the descriptions of the parcels and legal recordation as provided above. Parts of parcels shall not be described by plat reference, since they are no longer in the configuration of the previously recorded plat.
- (2) The property lines approved in the PPS and shown on the DSP shall, by condition of this approval, be delineated so that they are visible through the building footprints, and shown with a consistent line weight.
- (3) It is noted that, while all parcels included in the site have frontage on a public street, access to a public street is not provided for all parcels. These parcels collectively compose a “Lot,” defined as one or more record lots, pursuant to Section 27-107.01(a)(129) of the Zoning Ordinance, which has access to a public street. Any subsequent plans must reflect the “Lot” in its entirety in order to meet the access requirements of the Subdivision Regulations and the Zoning Ordinance.

All bearings and distances shall, by condition of this approval, be clearly shown on the DSP and must be consistent with the record plat.

- e. **Trails**—The Planning Board has reviewed the subject DSP for conformance with the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* (MPOT) and/or the Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and SMA. Because the site is located in the designated US 1 corridor, it was subject to the requirements of Section 24-124.01 of the Subdivision Regulations and the “Transportation Review Guidelines, Part 2, 2013” at the time of PPS.

The sector plan included a number of recommendations for sidewalks, trails, and bicycle facilities in the vicinity of the subject site. Text regarding the applicable recommendations is copied below:

Policy 1: Recognize that cyclists have differing abilities and comfort levels related to bicycling in traffic as vehicles, and those cyclists’ skills and abilities may change over time as new cyclists become more experienced.

Strategies

- **Provide paths and off-street facilities, where practicable and safe, to accommodate travel by unskilled cyclists.**
- **Provide on-street and off-street dedicated bicycle facilities, including cycle tracks, buffered bike lanes, and shared lane markings, where safe and practicable, to accommodate travel by skilled cyclists. Cycle tracks are the preferred option in walkable nodes and along the US 1 Corridor.**
- **Use walkable street design along US 1 and in residential neighborhoods to permit shared use of the street.**
- **Develop dedicated bicycle facilities (cycle tracks) along US 1 as the long-term preferred vision for the corridor. Support construction of marked bicycle lanes as an interim design solution. Coordinate with SHA, developers, the City of College Park, and other stakeholders to facilitate right-of-way acquisition or dedication of easements.**
- **Review existing signalized intersections along US 1 to ensure the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians (including pedestrians with disabilities) are being met, and make any needed adjustments accordingly in order to facilitate these modes of travel along the corridor.**

The DSP herein approved accommodates the cycle track facility by providing separate facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. The signal proffered by the applicant off-site will better serve the needs of pedestrians crossing US 1.

Policy 2: Facilitate bicyclists along the entire corridor and through development so that bicycle routes are enhanced or established.

Strategies

- **Provide bicycle parking, including bicycle racks and lockers, to encourage and facilitate bicycle travel.**
- **Encourage nonresidential and mixed-use developments to provide shower facilities and bicycle lockers as further incentives for increasing bicycle use.**
- **Study new bicycle facility types and programs, such as bike stations and shared use bicycle programs, and if appropriate, consider applying them in the sector plan area.**

The City of College Park and the University of Maryland have an existing bike share system called “mBike.” DPW&T intends to establish the regional Capital Bikeshare system in Prince George’s County and has funding in FY18 for Phases 1 and 1(a). It should be noted that the technologies for the two systems are currently not compatible. It is anticipated that, in the future, College Park may decide to transition to the Capital Bikeshare system or that a “blended” network of both systems will be developed. Details regarding the bike share program will be determined by the City of College Park and DPW&T. DPW&T is currently working with a consultant to determine appropriate station locations and they hope to purchase the equipment in the fall of 2017, with the implementation of Phase 1 in the spring of 2018. A preliminary analysis by DPW&T indicates that the subject site is a suitable location for a bike share station.

Bicycle parking shall by condition of this approval, be provided on the DSP. Short-term bicycle parking is recommended near the commercial space and long-term bike parking in the parking garage.

The sector plan also recommends bikeway improvements along Guilford Drive, as follows:

Guilford Drive (shared roadway): Sharrows and bikeway route signage.

The Implementation Recommendations chapter of the sector plan includes additional details related to streetscapes, amenities, and adequate public facilities. Elements such as sidewalk treatments, pedestrian and bicyclist amenities, and decorative elements are essential to creating a strong sense of place, and the streetscape recommendations are indicated below.

- **At the time of development, the developer/property owner (including the developer and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees) is required to install sidewalks.**
- **Special decorative paving materials, such as brick, precast pavers, Belgium block, or granite pavers, are recommended in the walkable nodes and at appropriate locations within the corridor infill areas.**
- **Sidewalk materials should be continued across driveways whenever possible, and accent paving should be used to define pedestrian crossings.**
- **Amenities, such as benches, bicycle racks, trash receptacles, water fountains, sculpture/artwork, game tables, moveable seating, public mailboxes, and bus shelters shall be required for all development.**
- **Streetscape amenities shall be consistent in design within a development project and should be consistent within each distinct walkable node, corridor infill area, or existing residential neighborhood.**
- **All proposed streetscape amenities shall be indicated on DSP submittals and shall include information of location, spacing, quantity, construction details, and method of illumination.**

The Complete Streets element of the MPOT reinforces these recommendations and 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.

Proposed On-Site Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements

Standard or wide sidewalks are reflected on the DSP herein approved along US 1, Hartwick Road, Guilford Drive, and the two main internal roads south of the retail space. The streetscapes herein approved are expansive and encourage pedestrian activity, particularly along the US 1 corridor and the main internal road. The cycle track is provided along the site's frontage, consistent with the area master plan. In summary, the following facilities are herein approved along the site's internal roads and associated road frontages:

- Eight-foot sidewalk or variable width hardscape area along Calvert Road
- Five-foot share use sidewalk and six-foot cycle track along US 1
- Eight- to eleven-foot sidewalk at the retail entries along US 1
- Seven-foot sidewalk along Guilford Drive
- Eleven-foot six-inch sidewalk along Hartwick Road
- Sidewalks along some private alleys

The Planning Board finds that the internal sidewalk network is comprehensive and will provide an inviting and expansive pedestrian environment on and along the site. This network will be supplemented by the additional sidewalk and crosswalk improvements recommended by the City of College Park, subject to the statutory cap.

Coordination with DPW&T and the City of College Park

A conference call was held with Planning Department staff, DPW&T, and the City of College Park on November 20, 2017. Items that were discussed included the internal road sections, frontage improvements along US 1, and off-site improvements required pursuant to Section 24-124.01 of the Subdivision Regulations. Regarding internal roads, it was determined that additional sidewalks are not needed on the road fronting the parking garage. The road is not intended for pedestrian activity, which is directed to the expansive streetscapes along US 1 and the main internal road that runs east to west through the site.

Regarding US 1, the applicant during the review process, modified the streetscape to include a more expansive zone for bicyclists. This area will function as a one-way cycle track along the site's frontage and will be delineated from the adjacent pedestrian zone. Regarding the cycle track:

- The cycle track for bicyclists shall be clearly delineated (by surface type or pavement markings) from the adjacent pedestrian zone. The City of College Park recommended that the pedestrian zone be constructed of brick pavers and the cycle track be concrete.
- The cycle track should clearly be marked and signed for one-way bicycle traffic. The ultimate development of the cycle track in this segment of US 1 will include one-way cycle tracks on both sides of the road that will serve both northbound and southbound movement.

Regarding off-site improvements, the applicant has proffered (1) a full signal upgrade at US 1 and Hartwick Road, (2) off-site sidewalk reconstruction for Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance, and (3) a bike share station. Discussion focused on which elements of the intersection should count towards the cost cap, the necessity of the sidewalk retrofits, and whether or not bike share made sense for the subject site.

Regarding each of these issues, the Planning Board reached the following conclusions:

- The signal upgrade will improve the environment for pedestrians by providing a traffic control device that is more predictable for both pedestrians and motorists. The upgrade will provide for safe pedestrian access across heavily-travelled, multi-lane US 1.
- M-NCPPC and DPW&T believe that the site is suitable for the Capital Bikeshare expansion currently funded in FY18. This capital bike share station (or other suitable vendor selected by the County) will complement the existing City of College Park “mBike” system and provide the future residents of the site with access to the regional (as well as local) bike share systems.
- The City of College Park has recommended crosswalk and sidewalk improvements to improve the pedestrian network around the site, which the applicant is agreeable to if funding remains under the cost cap after the completion of the signal upgrade and bike share station. The improvements recommended by the City of College Park were included in the bicycle and pedestrian impact statement condition of approval for the PPS.

Although the requirements of Section 24-124.01 of the Subdivision Regulations are addressed at the time of PPS, an exhibit showing the location, limits, and specifications of the off-site improvements is required by condition of this approval, prior to signature approval of the DSP, per Section 24-124.01(f) of the Subdivision Regulations.

- f. **Permits**—The Planning Board offered numerous permit review-related comments that have been addressed by conditions of this approval.
- g. **Environmental Planning**—The Planning Board previously reviewed the site for a Natural Resources Inventory Equivalency Letter (NRI-028-2017) and a Standard Letter of Exemption (S-028-2017), which were issued on January 2, 2017. The Planning Board has concurrently reviewed Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-17021 for the subject property.

The project is subject to the current regulations of Subtitle 25 (Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance) and Subtitle 27 (Zoning Ordinance) of the County Code that came into effect on September 1, 2010.

The overall site is 5.75-acres, zoned M-U-I, and located within the City of College Park. The site shares frontage with US 1 to the east, with Guildford Drive to the south, and with Hartwick Road to the north. The site is located at the southwestern quadrant of the intersection of Hartwick Road and US 1. According to the existing conditions plan submitted on August 31, 2017, and as referenced by NRI-028-2017, 100-year floodplain exists on-site. The primary management area (PMA) on-site is entirely comprised of 100-year floodplain. No other regulated environmental features are found on the property. This site is located outside of the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area. The site drains into the Lower Northeast Branch subwatershed of the Anacostia River, which drains into the

Potomac River basin. The site is located within a stronghold watershed. The predominant soils found to occur on-site, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS), Web Soil Survey (WSS), include Urban Land, Urban Land-Christiana-Downer complex (5–15 percent slopes), Urban land-Russett-Christiana complex (0–5 percent slopes), and Zekiah-Urban land complex frequently flooded. According to available information, no Marlboro clay exists on-site; however, Christiana complexes are found on the property. This site is not located within a Sensitive Species Protection Review Area (SSPRA) based on a review of a GIS layer prepared by the Natural Heritage and Wildlife Service, Maryland Department of Natural Resources. According to the 2017 *Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan*, the site contains no regulated or evaluation areas. This site is within Aviation Policy Area (APA) Zone 6 of the College Park Airport.

Natural Resources Inventory/Environmental Features

An approved Natural Resources Inventory Equivalency Letter (NRI-028-2017) was issued for the subject property, which is valid until on January 2, 2022. The equivalency letter was issued because there are no existing woodlands on-site, the site is fully developed, and an existing conditions plan submitted with the NRI approval identified the location of the PMA and the approved 100-year floodplain on-site. The on-site PMA, consisting solely of the 100-year floodplain, were entirely impacted by previous development of the site.

Preservation of Regulated Environmental Features/Primary Management Area

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 a 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 the County Code.

The PMA was previously fully impacted, and there is currently no stormwater management on-site. Redevelopment of the area within the PMA requires grading and filling to raise site improvements above the 100-year floodplain elevation, and establish suitable grades for the herein approved mixed-use development. Only a portion of the

buildings will be raised outside of the PMA. A variety of on-site stormwater management facilities, such as bioretention areas and sand filters, will be installed to improve water quality. These impacts to the 100-year floodplain were approved by DPIE with the approval of a floodplain waiver dated November 16, 2017, as well as a Stormwater Management Concept Plan, 37395-2017-00.

According to County floodplain information, the site contains approximately 2.1 acres of PMA comprised of 100-year floodplain associated with an off-site, bio-engineered stormwater conveyance system located in the median of Guilford Road. The area within the PMA is fully developed with buildings and parking. Impacts associated with the removal of existing pavement and buildings within the PMA, and replacement with micro-bioretention facilities and sand filters to treat stormwater, are acceptable land improvements for improved water quality. The Planning Board does not generally support grading and construction of stormwater facilities or buildings within the PMA, but given that the site was fully graded previously, the Planning Board supports the quantity of impacts to the PMA proposed with this DSP as necessary.

The regulated environmental features on the subject property have been preserved and/or restored to the fullest extent possible based on previous development of the site, the limits of disturbance shown on the impact exhibit and the approved stormwater concept plan, and subject to fulfillment of environmentally-related conditions of this approval.

Soils

The predominant soils found to occur on-site, according to the USDA NRCS WSS, include Urban Land, Urban Land-Christiana-Downer complex (5–15 percent slopes), Urban land-Russett-Christiana complex (0–5 percent slopes), and Zekiah-Urban land complex frequently flooded.

According to available information, no Marlboro clay exist on-site; however, Christiana complexes are mapped on this property. Christiana complexes are considered unsafe soils that exhibit shrink/swell characteristics during rain events, which make it unstable for structures. According to Section 24-131, Unsafe Land, of the Subdivision Regulations, the Planning Board shall restrict or prohibit land found to be unsafe for development because of natural conditions such as unstable soils and high watertable.

A geotechnical report detailing the presence of Christiana clay and proposed remedial actions to correct or alleviate the unsafe soil condition was submitted with this application. Such proposals are required to be referred to DPIE for a determination of whether the measures proposed are sufficient to protect the health and safety of future residents. A copy of the geotechnical report was forwarded to DPIE for review. In a review of the development history of the site and the existing conditions, DPIE determined that no significant movements have occurred on the site and there are limitations with regard to the proposed development. The project will be subject to further review at the time of permit, and DPIE reserves the right to impose restrictions, if necessary, prior to permit.

Stormwater Management

The site has an approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan, 37395-2017-00, that is in conformance with the current code and which is valid until August 5, 2020. The approved concept plan is consistent with the DSP, with DPIE requiring fee payment of \$86, 646.00 in lieu of providing on-site attenuation/quality control measures. The plan includes seven micro-bioretenion areas and two sand filters.

DPIE has also approved a floodplain waiver for development within the floodplain. The 100-year floodplain easement is required to be recorded prior to grading permit.

- h. **Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department**—The Fire/EMS Department did not offer comment regarding the subject project.
- i. **Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE)**—In a memorandum dated November 16, 2016, DPIE offered numerous comments that will be addressed through DPIE's separate permitting process.
- j. **Prince George's County Police Department**—The Police Department did not offer comment regarding the subject project.
- k. **Prince George's Health Department**—In a memorandum dated October 5, 2017, the Health Department commented and recommended the following:
 - (1) The demolition of the existing structures must be preceded by a raze inspection performed by the designated Environmental Health Specialist at the Department of Permits, Inspections, and Enforcement (DPIE) to assure the proper remediation of any asbestos containing materials on site.
 - (2) 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.
 - (3) During the demolition/construction phases of this project, noise should not 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 of this approval requires that the site plan note the information request by the Health Department, regarding items 2 and 3 above. The Planning Board does not review raze permits. The Health Department should coordinate with DPIE regarding their inspection.

- l. **Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA)**—In an e-mail dated November 16, 2017, SHA stated that plans for the project were reviewed and a transportation impact study approved. Further, they stated that an access permit would be required for modifications to the access points on US 1, and that the applicant should submit detailed engineering plans regarding the same to SHA for review.
 - m. **Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)**—In an e-mail received on October 2, 2017, WSSC offered numerous comments regarding the subject project which will be addressed through their separate permitting process.
 - n. **Verizon**—Verizon did not provide comment regarding the subject project. Coordination regarding public utility easements is reviewed with the PPS.
 - o. **Potomac Electric Power Company (PEPCO)**—PEPCO did not provide comment regarding the subject project.
 - p. **City of College Park**—The City of College Park offered comment regarding the subject project at the public hearing.
 - q. **City of Greenbelt**—The City of Greenbelt stated that they had no comment on the subject project on November 29, 2017.
 - r. **Town of Berwyn Heights**—In an e-mail dated November 9, 2017, a representative of the Town of Berwyn Heights indicated that the Town had no comment on the subject project.
14. 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.

Based on the foregoing and as required by Section 27-285(b)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance, the DSP, if approved with conditions, 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.

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 DSP 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.**

The Planning Board finds that the regulated environmental features on the subject property have been preserved and/or restored to the fullest extent possible, based on previous development of the site and consistency with impacts recommended for approval with PPS 4-17021.

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:

- A. Recommends APPROVAL of the alternative development district standards for:
1. Page 234—Minimum frontage buildout of 80 percent along US 1 (Baltimore Avenue) and Hartwick Road (To allow the frontage build-out along US 1 to be 61 percent and the frontage buildout along Guilford Drive to be 52 percent).
 2. Page 242—Lot coverage a maximum of 80 percent (To allow the lot coverage to be 81.98 percent).
 3. Page 234—Primary building setback is a maximum of 10 feet (To allow the primary building setback to be 12 feet).
 4. Page 239—Parking/Number of Spaces: 630 parking spaces required and allowed for the project (To allow the applicant to provide 769 parking spaces).
 5. Page 242—Loading Space Setback: Loading spaces must be 30-foot minimum from a sidewalk (To allow loading 25 feet from a sidewalk).
 6. Page 246—No greater than 50 feet between entrances (To allow more than 50 feet between entrance to retail stores).
 7. Page 251—Use Horizontal Lap Siding Hardiplank (To allow use of metal wall panels and cementitious panels).
 8. Page 266—Pedestrian Light Fixtures shall not be taller than 15 feet (To allow an 18-foot-high pedestrian light fixture when located on the internal streets).
 9. Loading Spaces—Two are required and allowed (To allow the applicant to provide four).
 10. Page 235—Front Secondary 12-foot build-to line (To allow a variable build to line along Guilford Drive).
 11. Page 235—Front Secondary 12-foot build-to line (To allow a variable build to line along Hartwick Drive)

12. Page 263—Streetscape (to allow the frontage of the proposed street on the west side of the site to not have individual or continuous planters, with parking on one or both sides)
 13. Page 254— Signage (to allow the two blade signs along US 1 at Guilford Drive and the exit just south of the Applebee’s Restaurant to measure in excess of nine square feet.)
- B. APPROVED Detailed Site Plan DSP-17003 for BA/WRPR College Park, subject to the following conditions:
1. Prior to certification, the applicant shall revise the plans or provide the specified documentation, as follows:
 - a. Revise the plans to be in conformance with the requirements of the Prince George’s County Planning Board’s approval of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-17021.
 - b. Include the following two notes in the General Notes of the plan set:

“During the demolition and construction phases, this project will conform to construction activity dust control requirements as specified in the 2011 Maryland Standards and Specifications for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control.”

“During the demolition and construction phases, this project will conform to construction activity noise control requirements as specified in the Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR).”
 - c. Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-17021 shall receive signature approval, and the site plan shall conform to parceling of that plan.
 - d. All bearings and distances shown on the subject detailed site plan shall be clearly legible.
 - e. The applicant shall provide proof of compliance with Federal Aviation Regulation Part 77.
 - f. Show the proposed property lines on the detailed site plan so that they are visible through the building footprints, and are shown with a consistent line weight.
 - g. The plan shall be revised to reflect the square footage of the commercial development approved.
 - h. Provide a minimum of 257 spaces of bicycle parking.

- i. Revise the parking schedule to indicate that handicap-accessible parking spaces must measure 9.5 feet by 19 feet and have an adjacent 5- to 10-foot-wide embark/debark area.
- j. Provide a complete garage layout demonstrating that all parking spaces have been provided.
- k. Add a sign chart demonstrating that the sign area is within the 10 percent allowance for each commercial façade.
- l. Revise the detailed site plan as follows:
 - (1) The shared-use pedestrian sidewalk and shared-use cycle track shall be shown along the site's entire frontage of US 1 (Baltimore Avenue) within the right-of-way.
 - (2) The shared-use pedestrian sidewalk along US 1 (Baltimore Avenue) shall be constructed of brick pavers, if acceptable to the Maryland State Highway Administration.
 - (3) The shared-use cycle track along US 1 (Baltimore Avenue) shall be constructed of concrete, if acceptable to the Maryland State Highway Administration.
 - (4) The cycle track shall be clearly marked and signed for one-way bicycle movement, if acceptable to the Maryland State Highway Administration.
 - (5) Streetscape improvements, including street trees and pedestrian street lights, shall be shown along the subject site's entire frontage of Hartwick Road.
 - (6) Provide an exhibit that illustrates all off-site improvements required by Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-17021. This exhibit shall show the location, limits, and details of all off-site improvements, including the signal improvement, bike share station, and other improvements recommended by the City of College Park, consistent with Section 24-124.01(f) of the Subdivision Regulations, not to exceed the cap.
 - (7) Provide short- and long- term bicycle parking throughout the subject site. Bicycle racks shall be provided near the commercial space and bicycle racks, a bicycle repair station, and lockers shall be provided within the parking garage, or other appropriate location.

- m. The applicant shall revise the plans to include a landmark feature, such as a tower or lantern or public art, as required by the 2010 *Approved Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (page 253), with final approval of same by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board, with input from the City of College Park.
 - n. Provide limits to the hours of operation and deliveries, demonstrating minimal impacts on adjacent properties.
 - o. The applicant shall provide scaled details of the proposed signs and elevation drawings showing the exact location of each sign on the façades demonstrating that the signs conform to the sign requirements of the sector plan
 - p. The applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall limit spill-over lighting onto abutting residential properties by limiting light levels at the property line to 0.10 footcandles or lower, as reflected on the approved photometric plan.
2. Prior to issuance of the first building permit within the subject property:
- a. The applicant shall submit an acceptable traffic signal warrant study to the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) for signalization at the intersection of US 1 (Baltimore Avenue) and Hartwick Road. The applicant should utilize a new 12-hour count, and should analyze signal warrants under total future traffic as well as existing traffic at the direction of SHA. If a signal or other traffic control improvements are deemed warranted at that time, the applicant shall bond the signal with SHA prior to release of any building permits within the subject property, and install it at a time when directed by SHA.

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.

* * * * *

PGCPB No. 17-166
File No. DSP-17003
Page 35

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 Geraldo, with Commissioners Washington, Geraldo, Bailey, and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioner Doerner absent at its regular meeting held on Thursday, December 14, 2017 in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 4th day of January 2018.

Elizabeth M. Hewlett
Chairman

By Jessica Jones
Planning Board Administrator

EMH:JJ:RG:ydw