

PGCPB No. 06-101

File No. DSP-04049

## R E S O L U T I O N

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 May 4, 2006 regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-04049 for Mazza Grand Marc Apartments, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The subject application is for a four- to five-story student housing building primarily for graduate students containing 231 units and two commercial parcels along US1 that are to be developed at a later date. The site consists of 22.5 acres in the M-U-I Zone. The application includes site, landscape, tree conservation, and architectural plans for the residential portion of the development, while the two commercial parcels along US 1 will require approval of a detailed site plan at a later date. This site plan also includes grading and infrastructure for the commercial parcels as well as a driveway off of US 1, extending through the future commercial to the residential development. 6.58 acres of land will be dedicated to M-NCPPC per continuation of the Paint Branch Stream Valley Park.
2. **Location:** The site is located on the west side of US 1 in the City of College Park, approximately 150 feet south of Hollywood Road. The site is also located in Subarea 4f (Central Gateway Mixed-Use Area) of the approved College Park US 1 Corridor sector plan, where detailed site plan review is required in accordance with the Development District Overlay Zone (DDOZ). The vision for this subarea is for "a mix of commercial uses along US 1 and multifamily residential to the rear, taking advantage of views into the Paint Branch Stream Valley Park."
3. **Surrounding Uses:** The property is zoned M-U-I with other M-U-I-zoned property adjacent to the north and south and R-55-zoned property to the west and northwest. Adjacent to the commercial portion of the property along US 1 are an automotive repair facility to the north and a retail sales establishment to the south. Access to the property is via a driveway off of US 1, through the commercial parcels to the residential parcel.
4. **Design Features:** The proposed four- to five-story student housing building wraps around a seven-story access-controlled parking structure providing parking and direct access to each level of the building. With 231 units there will be a total of 630 bedrooms. The units will have key-card access and contain anywhere from one to four bedrooms with a common living room, kitchen, and washer and dryer. Each bedroom will have dead-bolt locks and its own bathroom. The style of the architecture is reminiscent of older college campus buildings of the University of Maryland. The building backs up to the Paint Branch Stream Valley Park and a trail will be provided to the stream valley trail system, which connects to the University of Maryland. The amenities for the development include a clubroom with a business center and fitness center, landscaped courtyards with barbeque grills and sitting areas, and an outdoor deck with swimming pool.

PGCPB No. 06-101  
File No. DSP-04049  
Page 2

5. **Development Data Summary:**

	<b>EXISTING</b>	<b>PROPOSED</b>
Zone(s)	M-U-I	M-U-I
Use(s)	Vacant	Student Housing and Commercial Retail
Acreage	22.51 gross	12.26 net **
Lots	0	0
Parcels	3 (per Preliminary Plan)	6
Square Footage/GFA	0	1.25 acres (For future commercial development)
Dwelling Units:		
Multifamily	0	231 units (630 bedrooms)
Density Allowed:		48 DU/AC
Density Provided:		231 DU/10.65 ac. (Net lot area-Parcel 5) 21.65 DU/AC

\*\* 22.51 ac. - 0.14 ac. (area dedicated to SHA) - 1.08 ac. (parcel to be dedicated to city for Autoville Road) - 6.58 ac. (parcel to be dedicated to M-NCPPC) - 2.45 ac. (100 year floodplain) = 12.26 ac.

**Proposed Multifamily Unit Breakdown:**

<b>Number of Units</b>	<b>Percentage of MFDUs</b>	<b>Average Size</b>
19 One-Bedroom Units	8%	596 SF
107 Two-Bedroom Units	46%	868 SF
23 Three-Bedroom Units	10%	1,097 SF
82 Four-Bedroom Units	36%	1,446 SF

\* The applicant has requested an amendment to the bedroom size and percentage requirements, which is discussed in Finding 6 below.

**Parking Required: Minimum and Maximum Number of Spaces Per Sector Plan**

One bedroom	19 x 2.0 spaces	=	38 spaces
Two bedroom	107 x 2.5 spaces	=	298 spaces
Three bedroom	37 x 3.0 spaces	=	111 spaces
Four bedroom	82 x 3.5 spaces	=	287 spaces
Maximum Number of Spaces Permitted*		=	662 spaces
Minimum Number of Spaces Required*		=	596 spaces

PGCPB No. 06-101  
File No. DSP-04049  
Page 3

\*(The sector plan requires that the maximum number of spaces allowed is equal to the minimum required by the Zoning Ordinance. The minimum number of spaces required is the maximum minus 10%.)

**Parking Provided:**

Surface spaces (parallel)	15 spaces on Autoville Drive
Structured Parking	622 spaces
Total	637 spaces

<b>Lot Coverage Allowed:</b>	70 percent (Per Sector Plan)
<b>Lot Coverage Provided:</b>	26 percent
<b>Green Area Required</b>	60 percent (Per Zoning Ordinance)*
<b>Green Area Provided</b>	74 percent

**Required Findings:**

6. Section 27-548.25(b) requires that the Planning Board find that the site plan meets applicable development district standards. The site plan is in general conformance with the development district standards; however, the applicant has requested several amendments. If the applicant intends to deviate from the development district standards, the Planning Board must find that the alternative development district standards will benefit the development and the development district and will not substantially impair implementation of the sector plan.

The development district standards are organized into three categories: public areas; site design; and building design.

**PUBLIC AREAS:**

**P2.A. All roads within the development district shall have a continuous system of sidewalks on both sides of the street. Refer to the Street Edge Table (Table 16) in S3. Building Siting and Setbacks for the width of new sidewalks in the development district.**

The applicant has requested an amendment to the above requirement and provides the following justification:

“This standard requires sidewalks on both sides of the streets in the development district. The applicant is not requesting a waiver of this requirement, but notes that a sidewalk is not being shown on the southeast side of the proposed Autoville Drive extension. The Sector Plan proposes an extension of North Autoville Drive through the subject property. The applicant proposes to create a parcel to accommodate this recommendation and is showing a sidewalk on the side of the street abutting the proposed residential facility. In the southeast corner, the proposed road abuts Kitts Music, and a sidewalk could be provided in the event of a redevelopment of that site, as anticipated by the Sector Plan. Since a sidewalk on that side does not go anywhere or serve the proposed development, the applicant does not show the sidewalk on this detailed site plan. This

PGCPB No. 06-101  
File No. DSP-04049  
Page 4

issue is being noted for informational purposes.”

The applicant’s justification is adequate to find that the alternative development district standards will benefit the development and the development district and will not substantially impair implementation of the sector plan. The portion of the sidewalk not provided by the applicant in this case is adjacent to the Kitts property. A 2–10-foot-high retaining wall is required in this location because of the existing grades. When the Kitts property is redeveloped, a sidewalk can be provided at that time.

#### **SITE DESIGN:**

**S2.N. Parking garages shall be an integral component with the buildings and structures located on a parcel or property and shall incorporate similar high-quality building materials, color(s) and massing. The height of the parking garage shall not exceed the height of the adjacent buildings on the property. Whenever possible, the parking structure should be located in the interior of the parcel.**

The applicant has requested an amendment to the above requirement and provides the following justification:

“The parking structure meets all of the above requirements with the exception of the height of the garage. The garage is an integral component of the building and is located within the interior of the parcel. Along the front elevation, the only elevation visible from a public road, the building height exceeds the garage height. In the rear of the building, the garage exceeds the height of the building by 1 foot along half of the roof line and by 14 feet along the other half. A waiver of the requirement limiting the height of the parking garage is requested. In the initial design concept, surface parking was provided in the front of the proposed building. During the processing of the preliminary plan of subdivision, it was determined that a possible future extension of Autoville Drive should be accommodated, which eliminated the ability to provide surface parking within what may be a public right of way. As a result, an additional level was added to the parking garage. The Sector Plan’s objective for parking areas is to reduce the visual impact of parked cars in parking lots adjacent to all roadways, and to encourage the construction of parking garages. In this case a parking garage is proposed, which is wrapped with dwelling units. As a result it is not visible from the street, meeting the objective of the Sector Plan. The property drops topographically to the rear, however, and the top of the parking garage thus exceeds the roof height in this location. Since the need for the extra height is necessitated by providing the ability to extend Autoville Drive through the property, since the project provides an integrated parking garage, and since the garage is not visible from any public vistas, the modification requested benefits the development district and does not substantially impair the implementation of the Master Plan or Sector Plan. To the contrary, the proposal enhances the implementation of the Sector Plan.”

The applicant’s justification is adequate to find that the alternative development district standards will benefit the development and the development district and will not substantially impair implementation of the sector plan.

PGCPB No. 06-101  
File No. DSP-04049  
Page 5

## **BUILDING DESIGN:**

**B1.I. All multifamily buildings should provide a balcony for each dwelling unit above ground floor to articulate the building façade and to increase natural surveillance of the surrounding area.**

Comment: It should be noted that the standard above indicates that balconies “should” be provided. The sector plan states that the word “should” is a directive and not mandatory. However, the applicant has requested an amendment. See justification below for amendments to B1.I., B1.M., and B1.N.

**B1.M. The average size of all multifamily dwelling units in a development project shall be a minimum of:**

- 750 square feet for a 1-bedroom/1-bath unit.
- 1,050 square feet for a 2-bedroom/2-bath unit.
- 1,275 square feet for a 3-bedroom/2-bath unit.

**B1.N. Bedroom Percentages:**

**Bedroom percentages for multifamily dwellings may be modified from Section 27-419 of the Zoning Ordinance, if new development or redevelopment for student housing is proposed and the density is not increased above that permitted in the underlying zone.**

The bedroom percentages and unit sizes break down as follows:

Number of Bedrooms	Percentage of MFDUs	Size of Units
19 One-Bedroom Units	8%	596 SF
107 Two-Bedroom Units	46%	868 SF
23 Three-Bedroom Units	10%	1,097 SF
82 Four-Bedroom Units	36%	1,446 SF

Comment: Section 27-419 allows for up to 40 percent two-bedroom units, 10 percent three- or more bedroom units, and no limit for one-bedroom units. The two- and three-bedroom units exceed the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance for bedroom percentages.

The applicant has requested an amendment to the above three requirements and provides the following justification:

“These standards set forth certain requirements for multifamily dwelling units. These requirements are intended to apply to market rate rental housing, not student housing as proposed in this application. For example, standard B1(I) suggests that balconies should be provided for each dwelling unit above the ground floor. The requirements to qualify as student housing for

purposes of being exempt from the school facility surcharge contained in Section 4-352(a)(32) of the Prince George's County Code prohibit balconies. Standard B1(M) establishes certain minimum unit sizes for market rate housing. Student housing apartments are typically smaller in area and typically are rented furnished. Once again, Section 4-352(a)(32) requires that for a project seeking classification as student housing, at least 70% of the bedrooms must be less than 145 square feet or be smaller than market rate units. The minimum size of one bedroom units in this project is 596 square feet rather than 750 square feet. The minimum size of two bedroom units in this project is 868 square feet rather than 1050 square feet. The minimum size of three bedroom units in this project is 1097 square feet rather than 1275 square feet. Finally, Standard B1(N) addresses bedroom percentages. This Standard specifically states that the bedroom percentage requirements in Section 27-419 may be modified for student housing. In this case, there are 8% one bedroom units, 40% two bedroom units, 10% three bedroom units and 36% four bedroom units. The maximum percentage of two bedroom or larger units normally allowed is 50%. The Sector Plan specifically recommends multifamily dwelling units on this property to take advantage of the views in Paint Branch Park. Student housing is an appropriate use for the property because it provides access to the Paint Branch Park trail system, will be serviced by the University of Maryland Shuttle Bus and is within one and one-half miles of campus, as required to qualify for the school facility surcharge exemption. Thus, the proposed development implements a key component of the Sector Plan and the modifications requested are necessary to accommodate the specific type of multifamily housing proposed."

In this case, staff supports the amendments listed above and concludes that the alternative development district standard will benefit the development and the development district and will not substantially impair implementation of the sector plan.

**B3.C. All multifamily building types in a development shall have a minimum of 75 percent of the exterior facades in brick, stone or approved equal (excluding windows, trim and doors).**

The applicant has requested an amendment to the above requirement and provides the following justification:

"As originally submitted, the front facade of the proposed building was 100% brick and stone, exceeding the Standard. Since this is the only publicly visible facade and the longest facade, the remainder of the exterior facades not visible to the public were proposed to have brick for about one story. The City of College Park requested that the northern facade of the building, visible from Autoville Drive North if it is ever constructed, provide for a greater percentage of brick or stone. The applicant agreed to make this change and the City of College Park recommended approval of the modification to the Development District Standard. In our meetings, you [staff] have recommended that the southern facade which would be visible from Autoville Drive also be enhanced. We have provided you with a revised architectural rendering, which depicts 100% brick and stone on the front facade, 75% brick or stone on the north elevation visible from the right of way of Autoville Drive, and additional brick and stone on the south elevation where it would be visible from the future Autoville Drive right of way. With the additional brick and stone treatments, the total area of the exterior facade, which is brick or stone is 45%, less than the

PGCPB No. 06-101  
File No. DSP-04049  
Page 7

recommended Development District Standard.

“The applicant submits that the proposed architecture, as revised, fulfills the objectives of the Sector Plan. As the previous justification stated, the objective of the Building Design section of the Sector Plan states that applicants are to select materials and architectural details ‘which are appropriate to a building’s use, location and surrounding context.’ The proposed building is set back a substantial distance from Route 1 and will be largely screened by the Route 1 frontage development. This obscured visibility will exist until Autoville Drive is extended from north to south through the subject property. While this is a goal of the Sector Plan, such extension depends upon the redevelopment of several uses, which is not likely to happen for several years. Notwithstanding, the applicant’s proposed architecture ensures that the goal of the Sector Plan is satisfied. First, as indicated above, the portions of the building visible from these future public rights of way meet the Sector Plan requirement. Second, the applicant has upgraded the quality of the remaining facade treatment by utilizing Hardi Plank, a cementitious material, rather than vinyl siding. One of the key assets of the proposed site design is the retention of and restoration of environmental features on the property. The building will be built into the retained woodlands, which will shield the visibility of the remaining facades from public view. Exceeding the Development District Standards at the areas of public view, and upgrading the building facade not visible from public view satisfies the objective of the Development District Standard because the proposed facade is ‘appropriate for the buildings location and surrounding context.’ With the modifications requested by you and the City of College Park, the applicant believes that a modification of the Development District Standard is fully appropriate.”

Staff is generally supportive of the requested amendment. The objective of this requirement is “To select materials and architectural details which are appropriate to a building’s use, location and surrounding context.”

The building is sited on a wooded lot where many of the existing woodlands surrounding the building will be preserved. Views to the back and portions of the side elevations will be obscured from Autoville Drive. The front elevation and front portions of the side elevations will be the only portions of the building visible from the street.

The applicant has provided 100 percent masonry on the front façade, which will be the most visible elevation from the street. The building will be set back from US 1 by approximately 400 feet. Eventually retail buildings will be constructed along the frontage of US 1, which will completely screen the residential building from view of US 1.

The building will be visible from relocated Autoville Drive, a future 50-foot public right-of-way/service road that will eventually be extended as other properties develop to the north and south of the subject property. Views of the side elevations will be possible from Autoville Road in the future.

On the northern elevation, the applicant has provided 75 percent masonry on approximately 120 linear feet of the front portion of that elevation. Beyond that, the building steps back such that the side elevation will not be visible from the street.



PGCPB No. 06-101  
File No. DSP-04049  
Page 8

Along the southern property line, an average 100-foot-wide wooded stream buffer will be preserved between the property line and the limits of disturbance. On the southern building elevation, the applicant has added more masonry, but has not specified the amount. Staff is of the opinion that 75 percent masonry should be provided on that elevation for approximately 130 feet from the front elevation. This will ensure that when Autoville Drive is extended, the views for a significant portion of the southern elevation will be of masonry building materials.

The applicant's justification is adequate to find that the alternative Development District Standards will benefit the development and the Development District and will not substantially impair implementation of the Sector Plan, with a condition requiring a minimum of 75 percent masonry on the southern elevation for 130 feet from the front elevation.

7. **Conformance with M-U-I Zone**—Section 27-546.18(a)(2) and (4)

The above section of the Zoning Ordinance requires that residential development in the M-U-I Zone conform to R-18 Zone regulations. The Sector Plan has standards that override most of the regulations of the Zoning Ordinance. The detailed site plan is in substantial conformance with those regulations of the Zoning Ordinance that are not specifically addressed by the Sector Plan. See Finding 5 for conformance to density and green area requirements.

8. **Conformance with Preliminary Plan 4-04049:** In a supplemental memorandum dated March 28, 2006 (Thompson to Wagner), the Subdivision Office has indicated that the site plan is in substantial conformance with the preliminary plan (PGCPB Resolution 04-278). The approval of the preliminary plan anticipated the creation of additional parcels. The preliminary plan created three parcels and the site plan has six parcels. Parcels 1 and 2 are the commercial parcels; Parcel 3 is the driveway connecting the residential to US 1; Parcel 4 is future Autoville Drive; Parcel 5 is the residential parcel; and Parcel 6 is to be dedicated to the Department of Parks and Recreation. The Subdivision Section recommends the following condition of approval of DSP-04049:

**“Until such time as the parcel for Autoville Drive extended is conveyed to College Park as an extension of the public road, the development site for the multifamily development shall be comprised of Parcels 3, 4, and 5.”**

9. As required by Section 27-285(b) of the Zoning Ordinance, the detailed site plan represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines of Subtitle 27, Part 3, Division 9, of the Prince George's County Code without requiring unreasonable cost and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

## REFERRALS

10. In a memorandum dated April 17, 2006 (Asan to Wagner), the Parks Department offered the following comments:

The staff of the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) has reviewed the above referenced detailed site plan for conformance with the requirements of Preliminary Plan 4-04104. The



PGCPB No. 06-101  
File No. DSP-04049  
Page 9

project includes parkland dedication area and a connector trail on dedicated parkland. The following conditions of previous approvals are applicable to the subject detailed site plan:

23. The development of this property shall be subject to the following conditions as recommended by the Department of Parks and Recreation:
  - f. At the time of detailed site plan review, the applicant shall confer with the Department of Parks and Recreation concerning the exact alignment of the connector trail. Trail alignment shall be approved by DPR.

Comment: DPR staff has confirmed the exact alignment of the trail.

- i. The applicant, his successors and/or assignees shall construct the trail in phase with development. The timing for construction and completion of the trail shall be determined at the time of review of the DSP.

Comment: The subject condition requires construction of the trail in phase with development. Since, the development will be constructed in one phase, DPR staff recommends that construction of the trail shall be completed prior to certificate of occupancy of the residential units.

- j. With the submission of the detailed site plan, the applicant shall submit detailed construction drawings for trail construction to DPR for review and approval. The trail shall be designed in accordance with the applicable standards in the *Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*.

Comment: DPR staff has reviewed and approved the construction drawings for the trail and boardwalk construction.

11. In a memorandum dated February 2, 2006 (Metzger to Wagner), the Environmental Planning Section offered the following comments:

#### **Background**

The Environmental Planning Section previously reviewed the subject property, under the name Mazza Property, as Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04104 in conjunction with TCPI/50/04, which were approved with conditions. This site has an approved Storm Drain Concept Plan, CSD # 5898-2004-00, dated March 9, 2004.

#### **Site Description**

The site is characterized by terrain sloping toward the center of the site and drains into unnamed tributaries of the Paint Branch watershed in the Anacostia River Basin. A review of the available information indicates that there are areas of severe slopes, and there may be steep slopes on erodible soils associated with the site. There are streams, Waters of the U.S., wetlands, and

PGCPB No. 06-101  
File No. DSP-04049  
Page 10

100-year floodplain found to occur on the site. There are no Marlboro clays found to occur on the site. Baltimore Avenue is currently a collector roadway generally not regulated for noise. The soils found to occur on the site, according to the Prince George's County Soil Survey, are Sassafras, Croom, Hatboro, and Sunnyside Urban Complex. These soil series generally exhibit moderate to severe limitations to development due to steep slopes, high water table, flood hazard, and poor drainage. According to information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Program publication entitled "Ecologically Significant Areas in Anne Arundel and Prince George's Counties," December 1997, there are no rare, threatened, or endangered species found to occur in the vicinity of this property. There are no designated scenic and historic roads adjacent to this property. This property is located in the Developed Tier as delineated on the adopted General Plan.

#### **Environmental Issues Addressed in the College Park US 1 Corridor Sector Plan**

There are three environmentally related development district standards and related design standards that apply to the subject property. The applicable sections are addressed below.

#### **S6. Trees, Planting and Open Space**

Paragraph B states the following:

- B. The planting of trees on sites proposed for new development and/or redevelopment shall be counted toward meeting the Woodland Conservation Ordinance requirements. Street trees planted on abutting road rights-of-ways may also be counted toward meeting the requirement.**

**Comment:** The Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII/178/05) as submitted shows that the reforestation on-site is being counted toward meeting the Woodland Conservation Ordinance requirements. The entire requirement is being met on-site. No street trees are being used to meet the requirement.

Paragraph C states the following:

- C. Afforestation shall be accomplished through the provision of shade and ornamental trees. Tree Cover shall be provided for a minimum of 10 percent of the gross site area and shall be measured by the amount of cover provided by a tree species in 10 years. Street trees planted along abutting right-of-way may be counted toward meeting this standard. Exceptions to this standard shall be granted on redevelopment sites where provision of 10 percent tree cover is not feasible due to existing buildings and site features.**

The gross tract area of the detailed site plan is 22.51 acres. At the time of preliminary plan submittal, the gross tract area was 22.38 acres. This discrepancy is yet to be resolved. The TCP II as submitted provides 4.72 acres of woodland conservation that meets and exceeds the minimum 10 percent gross tract area requirement of 2.25 acres.

PGCPB No. 06-101  
File No. DSP-04049  
Page 11

**Comment:** No additional information is required with regard to this design standard.

#### **S7. Stormwater Management**

Paragraph A reads as follows:

- A. Low impact development techniques, as contained in the current version of the design manual “Low-Impact Development Design Strategies An Integrated Design Approach” shall be used on all sites as either the primary or secondary method of collecting and/or treating stormwater.**

The subject property has an approved stormwater management concept plan, CSD #5898-2004-00 with conditions to be addressed during subsequent reviews. The subject property is located in Subarea 4f, where underground retention facilities are strongly encouraged. The plan shows the provision of an underground facility and substantial areas of stream restoration work. A copy of the stormwater management concept approval letter was submitted with the application.

**Comment:** No further action is required at this time with regard to stormwater management.

Paragraphs C, D and E read as follows:

- C. If the construction of stormwater management facilities results in the removal of trees or existing woodland, the area should be replaced within the same site. Wherever possible, bioengineering techniques should be used to reestablish the woodland lost.**
- D. The use of underground retention facilities shall be considered through the development district, especially in the main street (3a and 3b) and town center (1a, 1b, 1c, 1d and 1e) subareas.**
- E. Stormwater management facilities should be designed as visual amenities that are visible from a building or a street, rather than located in isolated areas. Openings in any screening treatments shall be provided to facilitate observation of the area.**

The stormwater facility proposed is an underground facility that does not result in the removal of trees. It will not be visible because it is underground.

**Comments:** No additional information is required with respect to these design standards.

#### **Environmental Conditions of Approval from the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision.**

The Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, 4-04104, contained three environmental conditions of approval. The environmental issues to be addressed during the review of the detailed site plan are

PGCPB No. 06-101  
File No. DSP-04049  
Page 12

below.

**2. A Type II Tree conservation Plan shall be approved with the detailed site plan.**

**Comment:** A Type II Tree Conservation Plan was submitted with the detailed site plan review package in compliance with the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance.

**19. At time of Detailed Site Plan review, the impacts associated with the trail connection shall be further evaluated to reduce the impacts in compliance with an alignment approved by the Department of Parks and Recreation.**

**Comment:** Evidence that the Department of Parks and Recreation has approved the trail connection and alignment should be obtained.

**22. Prior to issuance of any permit which impact wetlands, wetland buffers, streams or Waters of the U.S., the applicant shall submit to the M-NCPPC Planning Department copies of all federal and state permits, evidence that approval conditions have been complied with, and associated mitigation plans.**

**Comment:** This condition will be evaluated at time of permit issuance.

**Environmental Review**

- a. The forest stand delineation (FSD) has been submitted for this proposal and was generally found to address the requirements for detailed forest stand delineation in compliance with the Woodland Conservation Ordinance. An examination of recent and historic aerial photos suggests that the site is predominantly wooded, traversed by streams and pervaded with severe and steep slopes as shown on the FSD map.

**Comment:** No further information is needed with regard to the FSD.

- b. This property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because it has a previously approved tree conservation plan. A Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/178/05, has been reviewed and was found to require minor revisions to be in conformance with the Woodland Conservation Ordinance. The gross tract area at time of preliminary plan and TCPI was 22.38 acres. The gross tract area for the detailed site plan is given as 22.51 acres, which is different from the original submittal and needs to be resolved.

The minimum woodland conservation requirement for the site is 2.02 acres based on a gross tract acreage of 22.51 acres. An additional 2.66 acres are required due to the removal of woodlands, for a total woodland conservation requirement of 4.68 acres. The plan shows the requirement being met with 3.30 acres of on-site preservation and 1.42

PGCPB No. 06-101  
File No. DSP-04049  
Page 13

acres of on-site reforestation, for a total of 4.72 acres of woodland conservation provided.

**Recommended Condition:** Prior to certificate approval of the detailed site plan, the Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII/178/05) shall be revised as follows:

- (1) Revise the plan to reflect the correct acreage of the gross tract area.
- (2) Revise the computation worksheet to reflect changes made to the plan.
- (3) Have the revised plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.

- c. Noise is not a major consideration in the review of this submittal. Baltimore Avenue is currently a major collector roadway as defined in the sector plan. Collector roadways generally do not carry sufficient traffic to generate noise levels above the state noise standards. No additional information is required with regard to noise.

**Comment:** No more information relating to noise is required.

- d. A proposed Stormwater Management Concept Approval Letter (CSD# 5898-2004-00) dated March 9, 2004, was submitted with the application. The requirements for stormwater management will be met through subsequent reviews by the Department of Environmental Resources.

**Comment:** No further action is required at this time with regard to stormwater management.

12. In a memorandum dated March 16, 2006 (Masog to Wagner), the Transportation Planning Section offered the following comments:

The Transportation Planning Division has reviewed the detailed site plan application referenced above. The property consists of approximately 22.37 acres of land in the M-U-I Zone. The property is located on the west side of US 1 in the City of College Park, approximately 100 feet south of its intersection with Hollywood Road. The applicant currently proposes 215 multifamily residences. Plan note 11 states more specifically the residences will be student housing.

#### **Review Comments**

There is an approved subdivision for the site, Preliminary Plan 4-04104. There are several transportation-related conditions on the underlying subdivision, and the status of these conditions are summarized below:

4-04104:

**Conditions 1(d) and 10:** Requires denial of access from Parcels 1 and 2 to US 1. No

PGCPB No. 06-101  
File No. DSP-04049  
Page 14

development is currently proposed on these parcels. OK.

**Condition 11:** Requires that Autoville Drive be reflected within a 50- to 60-foot right-of-way across the subject property. The extension of Autoville Drive is reflected as a 60-foot right-of-way. OK.

**Condition 12(e):** Requires at the time of detailed site plan that the proposed shuttle bus service to the University of Maryland, including the hours of operation, the location of the shuttle stop, and agreement from the University of Maryland, be evaluated.

The applicant has a written agreement with the City of College Park to provide a private shuttle to and from the University of Maryland that operates from 7:00 a.m. to 10:30 p.m., Monday through Friday. In lieu of the private shuttle, the applicant may obtain an agreement with the University of Maryland for an on-site UM shuttle stop. The applicant has also agreed to participate in a study with the city regarding transit and shuttle service options for the US 1 corridor and has agreed to pay a pro-rata share of the cost of the study not to exceed \$10,000. The applicant has also agreed to survey its residents concerning commuting patterns and habits and share the information with the city.

**Condition 13:** Requires transportation improvements at US 1 and Greenbelt Road. The required transportation improvements in this condition are enforceable during at the time of building permit. OK.

**Condition 14:** Requires dedication along US 1. While this condition is not enforceable until final plat, the current plan conforms to the requirement. OK.

**Condition 15:** Sets a trip cap for the subject property. This condition was based upon 240 units of student housing and two restaurants of 6,000 square feet apiece. This plan proposes 215 apartments with a total of 630 bedrooms. Using the trip generation rates that were approved for use at the time of preliminary plan, the site would generate 88 AM and 182 PM peak-hour vehicle trips. The stated cap is 172 AM and 265 PM trips; therefore, the current plan conforms. OK.

**Condition 16:** Requires location and design approval of the proposed access by the State Highway Administration (SHA) prior to detailed site plan approval. This must be confirmed prior to approval of the plan.

Comment: The Urban Design Section notes that the State Highway Administration has provided a memorandum dated April 19, 2006 (Bailey to Wagner) in support of the proposed access point and the detailed site plan.

Vehicular circulation within the site is acceptable.

The access point continues to be a subject of ongoing discussion. Staff is aware that the owner of adjacent Parcel D of Autoville does not want the access point so close to the existing building on that parcel. Neither transportation staff nor SHA wants the access any closer to Hollywood Road. In any regard, there must be a location and conceptual design for the access approved by SHA

PGCPB No. 06-101  
File No. DSP-04049  
Page 15

prior to site plan approval. SHA has the primary role at this stage in determining where the access should be placed.

The subject property was the subject of a 2004 traffic study and was given subdivision approval pursuant to a finding of adequate transportation facilities made in 2004 for Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04104. Insofar as the basis for the preliminary plan findings is still valid, and in consideration of the materials discussed earlier in this memorandum, the transportation staff finds that the subject property will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with transportation facilities which are existing, programmed, or which will be provided as a part of the development if the development is approved. This finding is conditional upon (a) approval of SHA of the proposed US 1 access point, as required by Condition 16 of the preliminary plan, and (b) the submittal and review of required information regarding the shuttle bus service, as required by Condition 12(e) of same.

13. In a memorandum dated October 25, 2005 (Shaffer to Wagner), the trails planner of the Transportation Planning Section offered the following comments:

**BACKGROUND:**

The approved College Park US 1 Corridor sector plan designates US 1 as a master plan bicycle/trail corridor. Figure 3 of the sector plan shows a preferred cross section for US 1 that includes five-foot sidewalks (with wider sidewalks recommended in areas of higher pedestrian traffic) and wide outside curb lanes to accommodate bicycle traffic. Staff recommends that any road frontage improvements for US 1 along the subject site be in conformance with this recommendation and include a minimum five-foot sidewalk. Any necessary right-of-way dedication and/or space to accommodate a wide outside curb lane or designated bike lane will be determined by SHA.

The sector plan also addressed access to the existing stream valley trail network, which runs immediately west of the subject site on the opposite side of Paint Branch. Several connections to this trail network were proposed in the sector plan, with one being recently implemented as part of the University View development. A bicycle/pedestrian connection to the existing stream valley trail is shown on the sector plan just north of the subject site in the vicinity of Kiernan Road. Some discussions have occurred between the applicant and the Department of Parks and Recreation concerning the trail connection from the subject site to the stream valley trail. A trail connection from the site to the trail will provide for nonmotorized (pedestrian and bicycle) access for students living on the site to the University of Maryland and could potentially greatly reduce motor vehicle trips from the subject site to the university.

Staff supports the provision of the master plan trail as a transportation connection for the site to the University of Maryland. Staff recommends the following provisions/modifications be incorporated into the trail shown the site plan:

- Extend the paved trail to the sidewalks along Autoville Drive. Sidewalks should be provided along both sides of Autoville Drive, not just the east side as currently shown on



PGCPB No. 06-101  
File No. DSP-04049  
Page 16

the site plan.

Comment: The Urban Design Section notes that the applicant has revised the plan to extend the paved trail to Autoville Drive and that an amendment to the sidewalk requirement has been requested and addressed in Finding 6 above.

- Where the trail corresponds with the access drive for the adjacent Duchene property, it should be a minimum of 12 feet wide to provide accommodation for driveway access to the site. Staff feels that a 12-foot width would adequately accommodate the trail and the necessary ingress/egress to the Duchene property.
- On the subject property, the trail should be entirely within a public use trail easement. This easement can be over the access easement for the Duchene property. This easement will ensure that the trail can be used by students and other residents living in the vicinity of the subject site and will further reinforce its role as a transportation connection. This fulfills the determination required in Condition 23.n. of approved Preliminary Plan 4-04104.
- The HOA or management of the Mazza development should maintain the portion of the trail on the subject site. The M-NCPPC Department of Parks and Recreation will maintain only the portion of the trail on M-NCPPC land. DPR will be able to access their portion of the trail from the existing M-NCPPC parkland.

Staff explored the feasibility of a more direct connection from the trail to the apartments. However, the steep topography and placement of ten-foot-high retaining walls in many areas along the back of the site appear to make this not feasible. Access to the trail will be from the sidewalks along Autoville Drive, which runs in front of the proposed apartments.

Staff has concerns with the proposed cross section for Autoville Drive. The applicant has reproduced the cross section proposed in Public Areas Figure P1 (Road Network) on page 170 of the sector plan. However, this cross section reflects a designated bike lane on only one side of the road. This is contrary to the current “best practices” guide for bike facilities, the 1999 American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials “Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities.” Figure 6 of this document illustrate how bike lanes are to be implemented, with designated space for cyclists along both sides of all roadways. Page 23 further reads:

**Bike lanes should be one-way facilities and carry bike traffic in the same direction as adjacent motor vehicle traffic. Two-way bike lanes on one side of the roadway are not recommended when they result in bicycles riding against the flow of motor vehicle traffic. Wrong way riding is a major cause of bicycle crashes and violates the rules of the road as stated in the UVC (Uniform Vehicle Code).**

Staff acknowledges that the applicant has done exactly as specified in the cross sections of the sector plan. However, the cross sections for Autoville Drive North and Guilford Drive may have

PGCPB No. 06-101  
File No. DSP-04049  
Page 17

been completed with an inaccurate or incomplete understanding of how best to implement the new bicycle facilities guidelines. Staff is of the opinion that the best way to adhere to the AASHTO "Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities" is to reallocate the space planned for the bike lane so that it is equally divided along each side of the road. While this will not allow for full bike lanes in both directions, it will provide for wide outside curb lanes (extra space in the curb lane to accommodate both the motor vehicle and the cyclist) in each direction. In the case of the side with on-street parking, the extra two or three feet should be placed between the area for parked cars and the travel lane, which will provide space for cyclists to ride a safe distance between the motor vehicles and the parked cars.

Staff believes that this solution will be the best way to accommodate bicycles given the on-street parking and 36-foot width of pavement available. Although the cross sections in the sector plan were intended to accommodate bicycles, the layout shown does not comply with current best practices and the AASHTO "Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities" and may lead to more motor vehicle and bicycle conflicts, not less, if implemented. The provision of wide outside curb lanes is another method for making roads more bicycle-compatible, and is preferable to having a bike lane along only one side of a road.

Comment: The Urban Design Section notes that the applicant has revised the plan according to the recommendations above.

14. In a memorandum dated March 29, 2006 (Izzo to Wagner), the Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Section offered the following comments:

This is a project to construct a student housing building. At this time it is intended to be restricted only to full time students. Under the present situation there is no payment of the school facilities surcharge. There is a possibility that at some future date this apartment building could stop being student housing. If that occurs then some provision is recommended to collect any school facilities surcharges that are applicable. The following condition is recommended:

If the housing is converted from student housing to multifamily housing for the general population, the owner of the property shall pay, at the time of the conversion, the school facilities surcharge in accordance with the laws at the time of the conversion.

15. In a memorandum dated January 23, 2006 (Bienenfeld to Wagner), the Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section indicates that a Phase I archeological investigation was completed on the subject property and that no further archeological work is required.
16. By memorandum (Rea to Wagner), the Department of Environmental Resources (Watershed Branch) has indicated that the site plan is consistent with the approved stormwater concept #5898-2004.
17. At a public hearing on March 28, 2006, the City Council of College Park voted to approve DSP-04049, subject to conditions. Most of the city's conditions have been addressed by the applicant. Conditions that are applicable for Planning Board approval have been added to the

PGCPB No. 06-101  
File No. DSP-04049  
Page 18

Recommendation section below.

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 the Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII/178/05) and modifications to development standards P2.A., S2.N., B1.I., M and N, and B3.C. as described in Finding 6, and further APPROVED Detailed Site Plan DSP-04049 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. If the housing is converted from student housing to multifamily housing for the general population, the owner of the property shall pay, at the time of the conversion, the school facilities surcharge in accordance with the laws at the time of the conversion.
2. Prior to certificate approval of the detailed site plan, the Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII/178/05) shall be revised as follows:
  - a. Revise the plan to reflect the correct acreage of the gross tract area.
  - b. Revise the computation worksheet to reflect changes made to the plan.
  - c. Have the revised plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.
3. In conformance with the adopted and approved College Park US 1 sector plan and approved Preliminary Plan 4-04104, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors and/or assigns shall provide the following:
  - a. Provide a minimum five-foot-wide sidewalk along the subject site's entire frontage of US 1, unless modified by SHA.
  - b. Provide the paved trail connection from Autoville Drive to the existing M-NCPPC trail along Paint Branch. This trail shall be within a designated 20-foot-wide public use trail easement and shall be a minimum of eight feet in width for its entire length. Where the trail is co-located with the existing driveway for the Duchene property, it shall be 12-feet-wide and asphalt to allow extra space for motor vehicles and to minimize potential conflicts with trail users.
4. Prior to certification, the following revisions shall be made:
  - a. The southern building elevation shall be revised to consist of 75 percent masonry building materials, excluding windows and doors for 130 linear feet from the front elevation.
  - b. Provide a note on the plan stating that access via Parcel 3 for the residential use is temporary and will be eliminated when Hollywood Road is extended.

PGCPB No. 06-101  
File No. DSP-04049  
Page 19

- c. Provide a note on the plan stating that access via Parcel 3 for the commercial uses on Parcels 1 and 2 will be addressed at the time of detailed site plan review for those parcels.
5. Prior to the certificate of occupancy, the 8-foot-wide asphalt hiker/biker trail and boardwalk shall be completed.
6. The applicant and its successors and assigns agree to provide access upon demand onto the property for future connection to Hollywood Road extended and to take no action on the property to compromise or block the eventual connection of Autoville Drive and Hollywood Road extended.
7. Prior to the issuance of building permit, the applicant shall submit a copy of its written agreement with the University of Maryland regarding the shuttle service.
8. The applicant, its successors and assigns, prior to the issuance of any permits, shall request a meeting with SHA in order to request that the temporary access driveway to U.S. 1 along the southern property line of parcel 2 (as shown on the current DSP) be realigned to the northern property line of parcel 1. The City of College Park and representatives of Jordan Kitts shall be invited to participate at this meeting. If the request to the SHA is approved, the applicant, his successors and assigns shall revise the DSP to reflect the new location of the temporary access road to U.S. 1.

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 Eley, seconded by Commissioner Clark, with Commissioners Eley, Clark, Vaughns and Parker voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioner Squire abstaining from the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, May 4, 2006, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 11th day of May 2006.

Trudye Morgan Johnson  
Executive Director

PGCPB No. 06-101  
File No. DSP-04049  
Page 20

By Frances J. Guertin  
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:SA:bjs

Aspose.Pdf