THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION
14741 Governor Oden Bowie Drive
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772
www.pgplanning.org

PGCPB No. 2020-114 File No. DSP-19068

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 June 25, 2020, regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-19068 for The Standard at College Park, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request**: The detailed site plan (DSP) requests to construct a mixed-use building with 283 multifamily dwelling units and 6,000 square feet of commercial retail.

2. **Development Data Summary:**

	EXISTING	**APPROVED**
Zone(s)	M-U-I/D-D-O	M-U-I/D-D-O
Use(s)	Commercial	Multifamily Residential/ Commercial Retail
Acreage	1.84	1.84
Lots	0	0
Parcels	1	1
Square Footage/GFA	62,220 (to be razed)	577,184
Dwelling Units	0	283

Other Development Data

Parking Requirements per the Sector Plan

Uses			**Spaces Required**
Walkable Node University	283 dwelling units	1 space per dwelling unit	283
	6,000 sq. ft. retail (including eating or drinking establishments)	3 spaces per 1,000 sq. ft.	18
Total Parking Required			301
Total with Shared Parking		Shared Parking Factor=1.2*	251
Total Parking Provided			**248****
Standard spaces (9 x 19 feet)***			125
Alternative Standard spaces (8.5 x19 feet)***			61
Compact spaces (8 x 16 feet)***			48
Handicap-Accessible			3
Handicap Van-accessible			2
Handicap Electric Vehicular			1
Car Sharing Space****			1
Electric Vehicular (8 x 19 feet)			7

Notes: *Mixed-use developments may use a shared parking factor to determine a reduction in the number of required parking spaces. The applicant has chosen to utilize the shared parking factor to reduce the parking requirement from 301 spaces to 251 spaces.

**The 2010 *Approved Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* has a specific parking requirement. Therefore, the applicant is requesting an amendment to this standard, as discussed in Finding 7 below.

*** The applicant is requesting a departure from the size of standard and compact parking spaces, as discussed in Finding 8 below.

**** The applicant will provide at least one car sharing parking space. This space is included within the total 248 parking spaces provided.

Bicycle Spaces per the Sector Plan

Required (1 space per 3 parking spaces)	84
Provided	156
Interior	146
Exterior	10

Loading Spaces (per Section 27-546.18(b)* of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance)

Residential / Retail	1 space (interior)

Note: *The 2010 *Approved Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* does not have a standard for required loading spaces. Therefore, per the M-U-I regulations, when a mix of residential and commercial uses is proposed on a single parcel, the site plan shall set out the regulations to be followed. The subject site plan proposes one loading space, internal to the building, which is sufficient.

3. **Location:** The subject site is located at the south side of Hartwick Road, approximately 459 feet west of US 1 (Baltimore Avenue). The subject property is also located in Planning Area 66 and in Council District 3, within the City of College Park. The property is known as Parcel C, College Park Towers, which was recorded among the Prince George's County Land Records at Plat Book WWW 47 Plat No. 44, in 1963.

4. **Surrounding Uses:** The property is bound to the north by Hartwick Road, and beyond by a multifamily residential development, known as College Park Tower Condos, zoned Multifamily High Density Residential (R-10) and Development District Overlay (D-D-O). To the east by existing commercial development in the Mixed Use-Infill (M-U-I) Zone, which is approved for redevelopment as mixed-use multifamily and commercial development, per Preliminary plan of Subdivision (PPS) 4-17021 and DSP-17003. To the west by multifamily development, known as Terrapin Row, both in the M-U-I and D-D-O Zones. To the south by Guilford Drive, and beyond, by multifamily development in the Multifamily Medium Density Residential (R-18) and D-D-O Zones.

5. **Previous Approvals:** The property is currently developed with a five-story office building and surface parking, which are proposed to be razed.

   On May 14, 2020, PPS 4-19047, was approved by the Prince George's County Planning Board, pursuant to PGCPB Resolution No. 2020-82, with fourteen conditions.

   The site also has an approved Stormwater Management (SWM) Concept Plan, 32294-2019-00, which expires on March 28, 2023.

6. **Design Features:** The applicant proposes to raze the existing site development to construct a mixed-use building with 283 multifamily dwelling units and 6,000 square feet of commercial retail uses on the site. The applicant has indicated that the dwelling units will be marketed to the student population. The proposed 9-story building will have frontage on Hartwick Road, Guilford Drive, and a new public street that will be constructed on the abutting property to the east, as shown on the approved DSP-17003-01, BA/WRPR College Park. The new road will provide access to the bottom level of structured parking and to an enclosed loading and trash area. A second level of structured parking will be accessed from Hartwick Road, through an opening in the center of the building.

   Pedestrian access is provided by the main residential entrance located in the middle of the Hartwick Road frontage and a secondary access on the Guilford Drive frontage. The 6,000 square feet of commercial retail uses will be located in the northeast corner of the building, with entrances on Hartwick Road and the parking garage. The building is surrounded by sidewalks on all four sides.

   Architecture—The building will be composed of acrylic panels, and brick, in different shades of red, grey, and white. Glass, as well as metal, decorative panels complete the composition. Dark grey masonry elements are used to ground the building, while glass and a ribbon of cantilevered balconies act as a landmark feature above the first floor glass retail storefronts on the northeast corner of the building. Red metal and decorative panels draw interest to the residential entrances on Hartwick Road and Guilford Drive. The two parking levels will be set into the grade and will have no internal circulation. The Hartwick Road (northern) façade will have a centrally located parking access that is flanked by the retail space and the residential lobby. The applicant has addressed the two levels of parking on the Guilford Drive frontage (southern) by recessing the ground floor to create a public plaza and arcade. Decorative panels will provide added interest to this façade. Details of these decorative panels were presented at the Planning Board hearing and a condition was added to require details and/or images be provided on the plans prior to certification. Brick columns break up the massing and metal louvers fill the second level openings. Red metal canopies highlight doors on the southeast corner of the building. The upper facades use a unique blend of materials and textures in a variety of ways to develop a distinct pattern that separates the larger building into smaller parts. The top stories step back and use light grey materials to cap the building. The eastern and western elevations continue a similar pattern of materials and colors.

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

   (1) Publicly accessible, ground-level, open space along Guilford Drive, including tables and benches; bike stations; landscaping; and decorative pavers.

   (2) Study Rooms on each floor of the building.

   (3) Main Clubhouse on Level 9 (rooftop), including study space; pool table; sauna; yoga room; fitness room; and roof deck amenities.

(4) Contemplative Courtyard on Level 2, including yoga lawn and café seating.

(5) Study Courtyard on Level 2, including bench alcoves and various seating.

(6) Active Courtyard on Level 2, including conversation lawn, booths, and tables.

At the time of PPS, the applicant was required to provide a public use easement over the ground level open space along Guilford Drive to promote the "Campus Center" public space recommended in the sector plan. The ground level open space will serve the residents of the surrounding neighborhood, as well as those living in the proposed development. Bonding for these facilities and the requirement for a recreational facilities agreement is conditioned, as a part of the PPS.

Signage—The applicant has provided a sign package for the project, which shows 10 signs in the following categories:

- Signature
- Canopy
- Blade
- Wall
- Retail
- Parking
- Parking Entrance
- Building Numbers
- Pedestrian Warning

The submitted sign plan for the project includes the square footage and all details necessary to fully evaluate conformance with the sign requirements of the D-D-O Zone. A proposed amendment has been requested for the blade sign and the Planning Board approves it. The applicant provided scaled details of all the signs and elevation drawings showing their location on the façades in accordance with the applicable sign requirements.

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 found to be 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 Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certified at a minimum of the "Silver" level. The applicant has requested an amendment to allow them to use National Green Building Standard (NGBS) "Silver" level. The applicant has not provided a LEED, or NGBS score card demonstrating that green building techniques may be utilized in the project to qualify it for NGBS certification. A condition has been included herein, requiring that a matrix be provided demonstrating the Silver level of NGBS, and that it is equivalent to LEED Silver.

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

   The subject site is in the Downtown College Park area and is within the Walkable Nodes (University) area. The Walkable Nodes (University) areas are intended to be hubs of pedestrian and transit activity, concentrating higher-density, vertical, mixed-use developments at appropriate locations, and providing a strong sense of place through thoughtful urban design along the Central US 1 Corridor. 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 the City of College Park and the University of Maryland, consistent with the land use and urban design recommendations of the sector plan.

   Requests to Amend Development District Standards
   The submitted application and statement of justification (SOJ) indicate the need to deviate from several development district standards in order to accomplish a development on the subject property. In accordance with Section 27-548.25(c), Site Plan Approval, of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance, if the applicant so requests, the Planning Board may apply development standards which differ from the approved development district standards. These alternate standards may be approved if they can be found to benefit the development and the development district and will not substantially impair implementation of the master plan, master plan amendment, or sector plan. The applicant is requesting the following modifications from the development district standards in Character Area 5B–Walkable Nodes (University) (all page numbers reference the sector plan):

   a. **Page 226 - Section 4.4 Landscape Manual – Screening Requirements:** The Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and SMA provides that the standards and regulations of the Landscape Manual apply, except for those regarding alternative compliance, commercial and industrial landscaped strip requirements, parking lot requirements, and buffering

incompatible uses. Therefore, Section 4.4, Screening Requirements, applies and would require screening of the transformers located behind the sidewalk on the east frontage.

The location of the transformers limits the ability to provide landscaping or sight-tight fencing, as required by the Landscape Manual. Given that alternative compliance does not apply, an amendment is requested to allow the transformers located on the east side of the building to be wrapped with an artistic covering or painted in an artistic manner. A sidewalk and existing easement prevents the transformers from being located on the west side of the building, and it is not ideal to have them located on the primary frontages. The applicant presented the proposed artistic treatments at the Planning Board hearing. The Planning Board approves this amendment to allow the transformers located on the east side of the building to be wrapped with an artistic covering or painted in an artistic manner.

b. **Page 235–Building Form/Character Area 5b/Walkable Nodes (University)**: Three amendments are required related to this design standard:

Parking Placement: Covered parking shall be provided within the third layer (a minimum of 20 feet from the build-to-line of the building)

The Planning Board does not interpret the proposed design to be in nonconformance to this development standard. Along the principal frontage on Guilford Drive, the covered parking is located within the third layer as it is setback more than 20 feet from the build-to-line. The Planning Board approves this amendment.

Frontage Buildout: 80 percent minimum at the build-to line.

The Guilford Drive frontage is proposed to be 77 percent relative to the building at the build-to line. The applicant cites conflicts with an existing 15-foot public utility easement along the west side of the building and the requirement to provide additional right-of-way to the east side of the building. The Planning Board approves this amendment given these site limitations.

Lot Coverage: Maximum lot coverage is 80 percent.

The applicant proposes 87 percent lot coverage and states that the additional lot coverage will allow for the three internal courtyards, density needed to support retail, and the proposed pocket park along Guilford Drive, which is mostly covered by upper stories of the building that are included in the lot coverage. The height of the building is limited from attaining the maximum allowed height because of the aviation policy area. The building is also limited in below grade and at-grade uses by the floodplain. Given the urban context of the site in the Walkable Nodes (University) character area and the limitations on the vertical elements of the building, a more horizontal building form is supportable given the building is meeting many of the goals and intent of the development district. Therefore, the Planning Board approves this amendment.

c. **Page 239–Building Form/Parking:** In the Walkable Node (University), the number of spaces required is one space per dwelling unit and three spaces per 1,000 square feet of retail. The total number of spaces required using the shared parking factor is 251 spaces. In this instance, the applicant is proposing 248 parking spaces. Thus, a modification of three parking spaces is required. The applicant states that the project will be used for student housing and the reduction is minimal. The Planning Board approves this amendment.

d. **Page 243—Building Form/Structured Parking:** Parking structures shall be set back a minimum of 50 feet from the property lines of all adjacent thoroughfares (except rear alleys) to reserve room for liner buildings between the parking structure and the lot frontage.

This development district standard assumes that a parking garage structure will be constructed independently, and that the primary use will "wrap" the garage. The proposed building uses podium construction that locates the parking structure at the base of the building and the primary (residential) use above. Because the garage is integrated within the design of the building, it will be a practical difficulty to setback the parking structure 50 feet from all adjacent thoroughfares.

The Planning Board supports the proposed parking garage design, as it will benefit the development, and approves this amendment.

e. **Page 245–Architectural Elements/Facades and Shopfronts**: Continuous expression line relates buildings to one another along the street.

A continuous expression line is shown along the Hartwick Road elevation from the west side of the elevation through the lobby and leasing area only. The applicant's justification is that the long façade needs to be broken up to allow variation. The Planning Board supports the proposed design, as it will benefit the development, and approves this amendment.

f. **Page 254 –Architectural Elements/Signage/Commercial Signage**: The maximum area of any single sign mounted perpendicular to a given façade shall not exceed nine square feet.

The development includes a blade sign that is 34.61 square feet. The blade sign is designed to be affixed to the north façade of the building (primary frontage), between the third and fourth levels. This sign identifies the building and is of an appropriate scale and location for adequate visibility to vehicular traffic. The Planning Board supports the proposed sign and approves this amendment.

g. **Page 256–Sustainability and the Environment/Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Certification:** Within Walkable Nodes, all

development shall obtain a minimum of silver certification in one of the applicable LEED rating systems. The applicant indicated that they do not intend to pursue LEED certification, and instead proposes to meet the certification criteria of the National Green Building Standard (NGBS) at the silver level, but a scorecard was not provided.
In general, both NGBS and LEED are green building rating systems that set standards and scoring criteria for evaluating energy performance measures associated with the construction and operation of new, or renovated buildings. While there are some differences, both ranking programs require evaluation of similar building systems and design features to determine efficiency levels and apply a score. The Planning Board finds that this amendment will benefit the development and the development district by providing green design techniques and will not substantially impair implementation of the sector plan. Therefore, the Planning Board approves this amendment request with a condition to provide a NGBS matrix and documentation that it is equal to the LEED silver certification.

8. **Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance:** The DSP application has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements of the M-U-I Zone; Airport Compatibility, Part 10B; and the requirements of the 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 applicant has requested amendments to, 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 application proposes a mixture of multifamily residential and commercial/retail uses in a vertical mixed-use format, in a large building. The building will be targeted towards students as is the adjacent student housing to the north and west. A mixed-use residential and commercial development to the east is under construction. More multifamily

residential is located beyond Guilford Drive to the south. The parking provided for the project will be available to both residents and visitors to the commercial retail establishments on the ground floor of the building. The developer has designed each of the components of the development to be compatible internally and externally.

(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;

The adjacent property to the west is Terrapin Row, a townhouse style, four-story, student housing building owned by the University of Maryland. To the south is Guilford Drive, which is a divided right-of-way with four-story, garden-style apartments to the south. A six-story, mixed-use development is currently under construction to the east. The six-story, multifamily residential, College Park Condos are to the north. The single building and uses proposed for the subject site are aligned with the vision and intent of the sector plan and development district, and is purposefully not compatible in size, height, and massing to existing buildings on adjacent properties. However, the proposed building is compatible with other similar redevelopment projects in the US 1 Corridor, within the development district.

(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;

The primary façade of the building, which includes retail and residential entrances, faces Hartwick Road. Secondary residential entrances are located on Guilford Drive. A new public street with sidewalk on the east side of the building and a sidewalk on the west side of the building will provide north-south connections through the site. There is one vehicular access to the garage on Hartwick Road. The new street to the east will also have a parking and a separate loading entrance.

(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 building covers most of the site, but light is provided around the perimeter of the site. The photometric plan provided with the application indicates that the proposed lighting design will minimize glare, light, and visual intrusion into nearby properties and buildings.

(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 materials and colors selected to face the proposed building are compatible with those utilized in similar scale developments recently constructed within the development district. The materials proposed include a mix of colored acrylic panels, glass, and masonry elements in tones of grey, white, and red. Trim, coping, and other detail elements are provided in darker complimentary tones and materials, as well.

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

The DSP proposes mechanical equipment on the east side of the building. Details of this screening was not provided and a condition requiring it has been included herein. The area will be directly visible from the adjacent property and the new public street to the east.

(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

The applicant is seeking an amendment to allow for a large blade sign, which the Planning Board approves, as detailed in Finding 7. All other signs conform to the applicable 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;**

The City of College Park will control the surrounding rights-of-way and will limit the hours of operation and deliveries, as it sees necessary. Internal loading will be accessed from a secondary street, with minimal impacts on adjacent properties, in accordance with this requirement.

(ii) **Location of activities with potential adverse impacts;**

Loading and trash facilities will be internal to the building and accessed from the new street to the east.

(iii) **Location and use of trash receptacles;**

The proposed trash receptacles are located internally to the building and have no adverse impact on adjacent properties.

(iv) **Location of loading and delivery spaces;**

The applicant has proposed one loading space on-site, on the northeast frontage. On-site access and circulation has been evaluated and found acceptable.

(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 application 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 DSP proposes a building of 9 stories, with a maximum height of 106 feet. The proposed building height is inconsistent with the building height restriction of APA-6. Therefore, prior to certification of the DSP, the applicant shall complete a Federal Aviation Administration Form 7460-1 and submit it to the Maryland Aviation Administration (MAA), and subsequently provide evidence that the project complies with FAR Part 77, as conditioned herein. If MAA identifies an issue, then the plan shall be revised to reduce, or eliminate any perceived obstruction identified by MAA.

c. The Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and SMA does not have specific requirements for the size of parking spaces. Therefore, Part 11 of the Zoning Ordinance serves as the requirement; 9.5-foot by 19-foot spaces are required. The DSP proposes a standard parking space size as small as 8.5 feet by 19 feet and compact parking spaces are reduced from 8 feet by 16.5 feet to 8 feet by 16 feet. Section 27-548.25(e), Site Plan Approval, for the D-D-O Zone specifically states:

(e) If a use would normally require a variance or departure, separate application shall not be required, but the Planning Board shall find in its approval of the site plan that the variance or departure conforms to all applicable Development District Standards.

The applicant seeks a departure for the standard and compact parking space sizes. The DSP conforms to all development district standards, except for those which amendments are requested and approved, as discussed in Finding 7 above.

The development district standards do not provide dimensional requirements for parking spaces, and as such, the applicable standard parking space size for the development is 9.5 feet by 19 feet, per Section 27-558(a) of the Zoning Ordinance. The applicant has proposed to provide a smaller standard space size of 8.5 feet by 19 feet. Approximately 25 percent of the parking spaces provided are designed to this standard, with 50 percent at 9 feet by 19 feet, and the remaining spaces provided for compact cars at 8 feet by 16 feet, and handicapped-accessible parking. In accordance with Section 27-548.25(e), a separate departure application is not required in the D-D-O Zone, and the applicant has provided justification for this request within the DSP application.

The Planning Board noted the requested width of 8.5 feet is acceptable and would not impair the functionality of each space. While a reduced size of 8.5 feet by 19 feet is supportable, the Planning Board finds that a slightly larger space size of 9 feet by 19 feet would be more functional where it can be provided and not impact the structure of the garage. A condition has been included herein to update the site plans to resize the standard parking spaces to a minimum of 9 feet by 19 feet, wherever possible.

The compact spaces require a length departure, from 16.5 feet to 16 feet. A six-inch departure in the length of the parking space does not pose a concern due to the expected low parking turnover within the garage. Reviews of the architectural plans indicate that the applicant has used a standard compact space of 16 feet in length; however, in many locations, the 16.5-foot standard can be accommodated. Therefore, a condition is included herein, requiring the compact spaces to be enlarged wherever possible. The 16-foot length is acceptable for compact spaces, where necessary.

The Planning Board finds that the departure, as revised, will not impair the visual, functional, or environmental quality or integrity of the site or surrounding area, in accordance with the required findings in Section 27-239.01(b)(7)(A) of the Zoning Ordinance.

9. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-19047:** PPS 4-19047 was reviewed and approved by the Planning Board on May 14, 2020 (PGCPB Resolution No. 2020-82). The Planning Board approved the PPS with 14 conditions, of which the following are applicable to the review of this DSP and warrant discussion:

   1. **Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision, the plan shall be revised to:**

      b. **Delineate the approximate area of the public use easement to be provided for the open space recreational amenity area along Guildford Drive.**

      e. **Dimension the width of the right-of-way to be dedicated and/or encumbered by a public use easement along the eastern boundary of the site as deemed appropriate by the City of College Park.**

      As conditioned herein, the DSP should be revised, prior to certification, to show all public use easements in conformance with the approved PPS.

   3. **Total development within the subject property shall be limited to uses that would generate no more than 172 AM and 209 PM peak-hour vehicle trips. Any development generating an impact greater than that identified herein above shall require a new preliminary plan of subdivision, with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities.**

This condition establishes an overall trip cap for the subject property of 172 AM and 209 PM peak-hour trips. The proposed mixed-use building with 951 beds for student housing and retail space totaling 6,000 square feet would generate 158 AM and 196 PM peak-hour trips as noted in the table below. This proposal complies with this condition.

Trip Generation Summary: DSP-19068: Standard at College Park								
	Use		AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
Land Use	Quantity	Metric	In	Out	Tot	In	Out	Tot
Retail/Restaurant	6,000	square feet	33	27	60	36	23	59
Less Pass-By (43 percent)			-14	-12	-26	-15	-10	-25
Net Retail Trips			**19**	**15**	**34**	**21**	**13**	**38**
Student Housing	**951**	**Beds**	**29**	**95**	**124**	**95**	**67**	**162**
Total Trips for DSP-19068			**48**	**110**	**158**	**116**	**80**	**196**
Trip Cap: PPS 4-19047					**172**			**209**

4. **Prior to the approval of any detailed site plan, the applicant shall provide an exhibit that illustrates the location, limits, specifications, and details of the Required Off-Site Facilities necessary to meet pedestrian and bicyclist adequacy, consistent with Section 24-124.01(f) of the Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations.**

   The applicant has provided an exhibit of the sidewalk improvements along the north side of Hartwick Road, which is consistent with the conditions set forth in PPS 4-19047.

14. **The private on-site recreational facilities shall be reviewed by the Urban Design Section of the Development Review Division of the Prince George's County Planning Department, for adequacy and proper siting, in accordance with the Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines with the submittal of the detailed site plan.**

   The applicant has shown the location and type of recreational facilities but did not provide the required calculations that should be provided prior to certification. These facilities include study rooms, courtyards, and a rooftop amenity space.

10. **2010 Prince George's County Landscape Manual:** The 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 proposed development is only subject to the requirements of Sections 4.1, 4.4, and 4.9 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. In addition, a review of the plans finds that the applicant has not conformed to the requirements of Section 4.4, Screening Requirements, and the Planning

Board approves an amendment for this requirement for the proposed transformers on the east side of the building.

11. **Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance:** The site is exempt from the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance (WCO) because the property contains less than 10,000 square feet of woodland and has no previous tree conservation approvals. A standard letter of exemption (S-172-2019) from the WCO was issued for this site, which expires on November 19, 2021. No additional information is required regarding woodland conservation.

12. **Prince George's County Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance:** The subject site is located in the M-U-I Zone and a 10 percent tree canopy coverage requirement applies, per Section 25-128(b). This amounts to approximately 0.19 acre, or 8,059 square feet, to be provided in tree canopy coverage.

    Proposed on-site plantings only provide 5,030 square feet of coverage, or 6 percent, and a waiver from the requirement was originally requested, in accordance with Section 25-130(a). However, the applicant did not include street trees located within the right-of-way along the property frontage that may be counted, pursuant to Section 25-129(a). With those 26 additional trees, the applicant will meet the 10 percent tree canopy coverage requirement. The Planning Board approves a condition that the applicant update the table to include the street trees and demonstrate conformance to 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, and incorporated herein by reference:

    a. **Community Planning**— The Planning Board reviewed a memorandum dated May 26, 2020 (Hartfield to Hurlbutt), incorporated herein by reference, which provided an analysis of the subject DSP's conformance with the recommendations of the 2014 *Plan Prince George's 2035 Approved General Plan*, the applicable aviation policy area, the Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and SMA, and an analysis of the proposed alternative development district standards requirements, as included in Findings 7 and 8 above.

    b. **Transportation Planning**— The Planning Board reviewed a memorandum dated June 8, 2020 (Masog to Hurlbutt), incorporated herein by reference, which offered that access and circulation are acceptable. The number and locations of points of access are consistent with those reviewed and approved during the PPS.

       The site is adjacent to Guilford Drive, a master plan collector facility with a planned right-of-way of 80 feet. Adequate dedication exists, and no further dedication is required of this plan.

From the standpoint of transportation, and in consideration of the findings contained herein, it is determined that this plan is acceptable if the application is approved.

c. **Trails**— The Planning Board reviewed a memorandum dated May 26, 2020 (Ryan and Hurlbutt), incorporated herein by reference, which offered the following summarized comments regarding the subject project:

The submitted plans reflect the relevant Complete Streets policies from the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation*. A network of sidewalks is included in the proposed DSP and serves the subject site, as well as crosswalks crossing all vehicle entrance points, per prior staff recommendations. The subject property fronts on Guilford Drive to its south, which features an existing shared roadway and sidepath. Sidewalks are currently in place along the south side of Hartwick Road and the applicant has included shared lane markings along this portion of Hartwick Road. The sidewalk network along the north side of Hartwick Road will be replaced and upgraded per the conditions of approval in PPS 4-19047. In addition, the submitted plans depict Americans with Disabilities (ADA) accessible curb ramps at all sidewalk crossings. The Planning Board finds that the submitted plans meet the design guidelines for safe, efficient, and convenient pedestrian access, per Sections 27-283 and 27-274(a)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance.

The submitted plans reflect the pedestrian and bicyclist facilities recommended in the Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and SMA. The DSP is a mixed-use development and fronts on an already constructed shared roadway along Guilford Drive. Designated space for bicycle parking that is convenient to building entrances is an important component of a bicycle-friendly roadway network. The submitted plans show inverted U-shaped bicycle racks at interior and exterior locations convenient to the entrance of the facility, along with a bicycle fix-it station. While the Planning Board encourages shower facilities at this site, it does not require them as the non-residential component is 6,000 square feet and a small portion of the overall development.

Based on the findings presented above, the Planning Board concludes that the pedestrian and bicycle transportation site access and circulation of this plan is acceptable, consistent with the site design guidelines pursuant to Section 27-283, and meet the findings required by Section 27-285(b) of the Zoning Ordinance, for a DSP for pedestrian and bicycle transportation purposes.

d. **Historic Preservation and Archeological Review**— The Planning Board reviewed a memorandum dated May 27, 2020 (Stabler to Hurlbutt), incorporated herein by reference, which provided that a search of current and historic photographs, topographic and historic maps, and locations of currently known archeological sites indicates the probability of archeological sites within the subject property is low. The subject property does not contain and is not adjacent to any designated Prince George's County historic sites, or resources. This proposal will not impact any historic sites, historic resources, or known archeological sites.

The Planning Board approved the associated PPS 4-19047 with a condition to do an inventory of the existing structure on-site prior to demolition.

e. **Permits**— The Planning Board reviewed a memorandum dated April 29, 2020 (Hughes to Hurlbutt), incorporated herein by reference, which offered comments regarding the subject project, which have been addressed through revisions to the plans.

f. **Environmental Planning**— The Planning Board reviewed a memorandum dated May 27, 2020 (Juba to Hurlbutt), incorporated herein by reference, which offered the following:

Natural Resources Inventory/Existing Conditions
The site has an approved Natural Resources Inventory Plan (NRI-104-2019), which correctly shows the existing conditions of the property. No specimen or historic trees are associated with this site. Almost the entire site is mapped within regulated environmental features, which include 100-year floodplain, and the primary management area (PMA).

Preservation of Regulated Environmental Features/Primary Management Area
A SOJ was reviewed and approved as part of PPS 4-19047 for impacts to the PMA. No new impacts are being proposed with the current application; therefore, no new SOJ is needed.

Soils
The predominant soils found to occur, according to the US Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) Web Soil Survey (WSS), include Urban Land-Christiana-Downer complex (5-15 percent slopes); Urban Land-Russett-Christiana complex (0-5 percent slopes); Zekiah-Urban Land Complex, Frequently flooded; and Urban Land. Unsafe soils containing Christiana complexes have been identified on-site. No unsafe soils containing Marlboro clay have been identified on or within the immediate vicinity of this property.

As part of the referral process, this case was referred to the Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE) for review to evaluate if further information is required regarding the unsafe soils on-site. In an email dated March 31, 2020, DPIE stated that no further information is required, as there are no slopes of significant concern identified within the area of this soil type and the applicant is proposing to cut and fill the site to a one percent grade for a buildable area.
A geotechnical review was not required with this application. The County may require a soils report, in conformance with Prince George's County Council Bill CB-94-2004, during future phases of development.

Specimen, Champion, or Historic Trees
In accordance with approved NRI-104-2019, no specimen, champion, or historic trees have been identified on the subject property.

Stormwater Management
An approved SWM Concept Plan and associated letter, 32294-2019-00, was submitted with this application. The approved SWM plan shows the use of one sand filter. DPIE has granted a floodplain waiver for construction within the 100-year floodplain since almost the entire site is currently located within it.

g. **Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department**—The Fire Department did not offer comments on the subject application.

h. **Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE)**— DPIE did not offer comments on the subject application.

i. **Prince George's County Police Department**— The Planning Board reviewed a memorandum dated May 14, 2020, (Contic to Hurlbutt), incorporated herein by reference, in which the Police Department offered no comment on the subject project.

j. **Prince George's Health Department**—The Health Department did not offer comments on the subject application.

k. **Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA)**— The Planning Board reviewed a letter dated August 20, 2020 (Cook to Hurlbutt), incorporated herein by reference, in which SHA reviewed the traffic study and offered no comment.

l. **Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)**— The Planning Board reviewed an e-mail received on April 1, 2020 (Hall to Hurlbutt), incorporated herein by reference, in which WSSC offered numerous comments regarding the subject project which will be addressed through their separate permitting process.

m. **City of College Park**— The Planning Board reviewed a letter dated June 10, 2020 (Schum to Hewlett), incorporated herein by reference, which stated that the City of College Park City Council, at their meeting on June 9, 2020, voted 8-0-0 to recommend approval of DSP-19068 with conditions, and approval of the requested departures for parking space design, transformer screening, and loading space. The relative conditions have been incorporated in this approval.

n. **City of Greenbelt**—The City of Greenbelt did not offer comments on the subject application.

o. **Town of Berwyn Heights**—The Town of Berwyn Height did not offer comments on the subject application.

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. The amendments to the development district standards required for this development would benefit the development and the

development district, as required by Section 27-548.25(c) of the Zoning Ordinance, and would not substantially impair implementation of the sector plan.

Based on the foregoing and as required by Section 27-285(b)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance, the 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 in accordance with the requirement of Subtitle 24-130(b)(5).

The regulated environmental features on the subject property have been preserved and/or restored to the fullest extent possible based on the evaluation provided with PPS 4-19047.

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-19068 for the above described land, subject to the following conditions:

A. APPROVAL of the alternative development district standards for:

1. **Page 235–Building Form/Character Area 5b/ Walkable Nodes (University):** To allow covered parking within a minimum setback of 20 feet from the build-to-line of the building and to reduce the amount of the building at the build-to line along Guilford Drive to 77 percent.

2. **Page 235–Building Form/Character Area 5b/ Walkable Nodes (University):** To exceed the maximum lot coverage of 80 percent, by providing 87 percent lot coverage.

3. **Page 239—Building Form/Parking:** To reduce the amount of required parking by three parking spaces.

4. **Page 243—Building Form/Structured Parking:** To allow the parking structure to be setback less than 50 feet from the adjacent thoroughfares.

5. **Page 245–Architectural Elements/Facades and Shopfronts**: To not provide a continuous expression line.

6. **Page 254–Architectural Elements/Signage/Commercial Signage**: To allow a 34.61-square-foot blade sign, exceeding the 9 square feet maximum.

7. **Page 256–Sustainability and the Environment/Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Certification**: To allow for National Green Building Standard silver certification.

8. **Page 226 - Section 4.4 Landscape Manual – Screening Requirements:** To allow the transformers located on the east side of the building to be wrapped with an artistic covering or painted in an artistic manner.

B. APPROVAL of Detailed Site Plan DSP-19068 for The Standard at College Park, including a departure from the required parking space size for 8.5-foot by 19-foot standard spaces and 8-foot by 16-foot compact spaces, subject to the following conditions:

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

   a. Provide a detail of the decorative treatment proposed for the Guilford Drive frontage (consistent with Applicant's Exhibit # 2), to be reviewed by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board, with referral to the City of College Park staff.

   b. Revise the landscape plan and schedule to demonstrate conformance with Prince George's County Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance.

   c. Provide the on-site recreational facilities costs and calculation, in accordance with the Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines.

   d. Provide details of how the transformers on the east side of the building will be wrapped with an artistic covering, or painted in an artistic manner (consistent with Applicant's Exhibit #3), or will conform to Section 4.4, Screening Requirements, of the Prince George's County Landscape Manual.

   e. Correct parking tables to be consistent with this approval.

   f. Correct lot coverage on the development table.

   g. Provide proof of compliance with Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 77.

   h. Provide a matrix demonstrating National Green Building Standard (NGBS) Silver Level is equivalent to LEED Silver, and how it will be achieved for the proposed development.

i. Show all public use easements required by the approval of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-19047 on the site plan.

j. Revise Sheet A0-01 to designate parking space #53 as a compact space.

k. Revise Sheets A0-00 and A0-01 to provide compact parking spaces sized a minimum of 8 feet by 16.5 feet, wherever feasible.

l. Revise Sheets A0-00 and A0-01 to provide standard parking spaces sized a minimum of 9 feet by 19 feet, wherever feasible.

m. Provide at least one car sharing parking space.

n. Provide a continuous expression line above the second floor along the Hartwick Road façade and extend the balconies on this façade to meet the expression line.

o. Rearrange the colored acrylic panels along the Hartwick Road facade to enhance the verticality and mitigate the massing of the building.

p. Provide a detail of the proposed decorative panels to screen the parking garage along Guilford Drive.

q. Provide the location and type of trees and pedestrian lighting for the streetscapes along Hartwick Road, Guilford Drive and the new access road. These details should be consistent with the streetscapes provided to the east and west of the subject site.

r. Revise the landscape and hardscape plans for Guilford Road pocket park to enhance accessibility by the public and improve the pedestrian experience. The following should be considered:

(1) Replace as much of the metal railing along the sidewalk as feasible with steps into the below-grade space.

(2) Create a more open plaza area at the intersection of Guilford Drive and the new street.

(3) Where feasible, show trees planted along the sidewalk edge on applicant's property to align with street trees for more effect.

s. Revise the sign plan to clarify sign construction details to ensure that panelized back lighting and box lighting fixtures are not provided.

2. Prior to issuance of the final certificate of occupancy of the building, the applicant shall demonstrate that all on-site recreational facilities have been fully constructed and are operational.

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 Geraldo, with Commissioners Washington, Geraldo, Bailey, Doerner and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, June 25, 2020, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 9th day of July 2020.

Elizabeth M. Hewlett
Chairman

Jessica Jones

By Jessica Jones
Planning Board Administrator

EMH:JJ:JH:nz

APPROVED AS TO LEGAL SUFFICIENCY

Peter Gaus Smith

M-NCPPC Legal Department
Date: June 30, 2020