

RESOLUTION

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

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on September 21, 2017, regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-05044-08 for Steeplechase Business Park, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The subject detailed site plan (DSP) application proposes to develop the property with a 74,789-square-foot, 123-room, 5-story hotel building including amenities such as a swimming pool, fitness center, room and concierge service, and a restaurant in accordance with County Council Bill CB-97-2004.
2. **Development Data Summary:**

	EXISTING	APPROVED
Zone	I-1	I-1
Use	Vacant	Hotel
Gross Acreage	2.79	2.79
Net Acreage	2.79	2.79
Parcels/Lots	2	2
Gross Floor Area (GFA) of Building	0	74,789 sq. ft.

OTHER DEVELOPMENT DATA

Parking Spaces for this DSP:
Hotel Use – 1 space / 2 Guest Rooms
 Hotel (123 Rooms)

61 spaces

Total Required **61 spaces**

Parking Spaces Provided:

Standard spaces (9.5 ft. x 19 ft.)	70 spaces
Compact spaces (9.5 ft. x 19 ft.)	46 spaces*
Handicap Spaces (13 ft. x 19 ft.)	5 spaces
Van Spaces (16 ft. x 19 ft.)	2 spaces

Total Spaces Provided **123 spaces****

Note: *Per Section 27-559(a) of the Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Board noted that the number of compact spaces shall not exceed one-third of the total required number of spaces. This application proposes 37 percent, exceeding the maximum allowed number of compact spaces, and should be revised prior to certification. A condition has been included in this approval requiring the revision.

**The Planning Board noted that the schedule on the plan shows a total of 116 spaces provided, not 123 as calculated above and should be updated to reflect the correct number of spaces. A condition has been included in this approval to revise the parking schedule.

3. **Location:** The subject property is known as Parcels 37 and 64, which are located on the south side of Alaking Court in the Steeplechase Business Park, approximately 1,200 feet from the intersection of Alaking Court and Hampton Park Boulevard, and northwest of the intersection with the Capital Beltway (I-95/495) and Ritchie Marlboro Road, in Planning Area 75A, and Council District 6.
4. **Surrounding Uses:** The subject property, Parcels 37 and 64, are bounded to the north by the public right-of-way of Alaking Court with the remainder of the industrial portion of Steeplechase Business Park beyond; to the east by Parcel 35 in the business park, which is currently undeveloped property in the Light Industrial (I-1) Zone; to the south and west by the exit ramp from the south-bound Capital Beltway (I-95/495), with a WAWA gas station and a Chick-fil-A fast-food restaurant within the business park beyond.
5. **Previous Approvals:** In 2004, the Prince George's County Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03113 for the Steeplechase Business Park. In 2006, the Prince George's District Council approved Detailed Site Plan DSP-05044 for the retail portion of the development along Alaking Court, approving the general site design without approving architecture for the proposed buildings. In 2007, the District Council approved Detailed Site Plan DSP-05044-01, which included architecture for the western portion of the site, but not the eastern portion of the site. In conjunction with DSP-05044-01, the Planning Board and District Council also approved Departure from Sign Design Standards DSDS-641 for freestanding and building-mounted signage. Detailed Site Plan DSP-05044-02 was approved by the Planning Board in 2009 for a bank on former Parcel 18, now Parcel 37. Four subsequent Planning Director-level amendments have since been approved for minor site and architectural changes (DSP-05044-03, DSP-05044-04, DSP-05044-05, and DSP-05044-06). Detailed Site Plan DSP-05044-07, which was approved by the Planning Board in January 2014, was for a multi-tenant retail building within Steeplechase Business Park. The 2010 *Glenn Dale-Seabrook-Lanham and Vicinity Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (Glenn Dale-Seabrook-Lanham Sector Plan and SMA) maintained the I-1 Zone on the subject property. The property also has an approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan, 8004290-2000-09, which was submitted with the subject application. This concept approval is valid until April 17, 2020.

6. **Design Features:** The subject site is part of the larger Steeplechase Business Park. The application is for the development of Parcels 37 and 64, which are located on the eastern most portion of the business park. The site plan proposes the construction of a 123-room hotel including a restaurant, in lieu of the previously approved 10,000-square-foot sit-down restaurant.

The site is accessed from Alaking Court, which is a public road intersecting with Hampton Park Boulevard to the west. The site proposes one two-way ingress and egress point to the site and includes a covered drop-off area on the eastern side of the building. A two-way traffic pattern continues on-site in a looped fashion around the building. The site also has 116 head-in parking spaces and a five-foot sidewalk, which circles the building.

Architecture—The building is generally rectangular and includes a flat roof with variation across the length of the building. The application proposes a five-story building that is 58 feet in height. The front of the hotel faces Alaking Court, while the rear of the building faces the Capital Beltway (I-95/495). The building has been designed to incorporate a variety of building materials into the building façade on all sides of the structure and complements the surrounding uses. The building includes a series of canopies over the building entrances and uses several building materials and complimentary colors including cementitious board, glass, masonry, and stone veneer accents to create a clean, contemporary, and modern design.

Recreational Facilities—Outdoor patio space with tables and seating has been provided for the employees or users of the hotel near the pool and dining areas.

Lighting—This DSP proposes lighting throughout the site to illuminate the building, parking areas, as well as loading spaces on the site. The site plan shows 30-foot-tall pole-mounted lighting throughout the parking area and provides a balanced-lighting pattern on the property while not causing a glare onto adjoining properties. The Planning Board noted that no building-mounted lighting has been proposed with this application on the hotel building itself or near the building entrances to highlight their location and provide patrons with a bright, and safe atmosphere, and should be shown on the plan.

Signage—Two building-mounted signs are located on the southeast and northeast elevations and one freestanding sign is being proposed with this application.

A detail for the freestanding sign is provided with the plan set and proposes a pylon sign which advertises the name of the facility. It is proposed to be internally illuminated with a proposed height of 20 feet. It reflects the tenants name and logo on the sign. The sign includes a signage face of approximately 50 square feet.

Two building-mounted signs are located on the northwest and southwest elevations which advertise the name of the hotel chain. Each of these signs show a proposed sign area of 63 square feet, which is acceptable.

The following table includes the sign type, proposed height, and area of the freestanding and building-mounted signs proposed with this application:

Sign location	Advertising	Sign type	Height of sign	Area of sign
Alaking Court	Tenant name	Pylon	20 feet	50 sq. ft.
North East Elevation	Tenant name	Building-mounted	45 feet	63 sq. ft.
South East Elevation	Tenant name	Building-mounted	40 feet	63 sq. ft.

Section 27-613 of the Zoning Ordinance provides regulations for building-mounted signs. The maximum permissible area of building signs is dependent upon the building width. The area of all of the signs on a building containing more than three stories shall be not more than three square feet of area for each one lineal foot of width along the front of the building, to a maximum of 400 square feet. One additional square foot of sign area for each additional story shall be allowed, to a maximum of 400 square feet of total sign area for each building. The maximum allowable signage area for the building-mounted signs based on the building length of 210 feet is greater than the maximum of 400 square feet. Therefore, the maximum area of 400 square feet would apply, and the building-mounted signs proposed with this application are within the allowable area.

Section 27-614 of the Zoning Ordinance, provides regulations for freestanding signs. The maximum allowable area for the sign is 140 feet, which is calculated as one-square-foot of sign area for each two lineal feet of street frontage, to a maximum of 200 square feet. The DSP proposes 50 square feet and the allowable square footage based on the building's street frontage of 210 feet, which is 105 square feet. The signage area of the freestanding sign is within the allowable square footage. However, given that the building-mounted signs are easily seen from the Capital Beltway, the Planning Board recommended that the 20-foot pylon sign located along the site's Alaking Court frontage be reduced to a nine-foot-tall monumental entrance sign, to be in proportion with the interior roadway. A condition has been included in this approval requiring the applicant to make this change prior to certification.

CONFORMANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance:** The subject application has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements in the I-1 Zone and with the site design guidelines of the Zoning Ordinance.
 - a. The subject application is in conformance with the requirements of Section 27-473(b) of the Zoning Ordinance, which governs uses in the industrial zones. The proposed hotel use is a permitted use in the I-1 Zone without the requirement of a special exception provided it meets the following criteria outlined in Section.27-473(b)(7)(C) as amended by Council Bill CB-97-2004:

- (A) The use is located within an industrial park which is adjacent to a Beltway interchange constructed after June 2002;**

The Planning Board noted that the proposed use is located within the Steeplechase Business Park, which is adjacent to a Capital Beltway interchange that was built after June 2002.

- (B) The parcel(s) is the subject of a Preliminary Plan of Subdivision that was approved pursuant to Subtitle 24 of this Code prior to June 30, 2004;**

The Planning Board noted that the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03113 was approved on March 11, 2004, and meets this requirement

- (C) A Detailed Site Plan shall be approved in accordance with Part 3, Division 9, of this Subtitle;**

The Planning Board noted that a DSP has been filed and meets this requirement

- (D) The acreage of lots (used for commercial purposes) shall not exceed twenty-five percent (25%) of the acreage of lots used for industrial purposes in the industrial park;**

The Planning Board noted that the commercial/retail use acreage is 21.5 percent of the total industrial use acreage.

- (E) No more than two (2) fast-food restaurants shall be allowed in the industrial park;**

The Planning Board noted that the only two fast-food restaurants exist within Steeplechase Business Park (Sonic and Chick-fil-A).

- (F) Motels are prohibited; and**

The Planning Board noted that the subject application is not for a motel.

- (G) Hotel amenities shall include at a minimum a swimming pool, fitness center, room service, concierge service, parking, and restaurant(s) located within the building.**

The Planning Board noted that all amenities have been included in the hotel proposed on Parcels 37 and 64.

- b. **Site Design Guidelines**—Section 27-283 of the Zoning Ordinance provides that a DSP should be designed in accordance with the same design guidelines for a conceptual site plan (Section 27-274), which provides design guidelines regarding parking, loading, and circulation, lighting, views, green area, site and streetscape amenities, grading, service areas, public spaces, and architecture. Section 27-274(a) of the Zoning Ordinance further requires the applicant demonstrate the following:

Section 27-274

(2) Parking, loading, and circulation

- (A) Surface parking lots should be located and designed to provide safe and efficient vehicular and pedestrian circulation within the site, while minimizing the visual impact of cars. Parking spaces should be located to provide convenient access to major destination points on the site.**
- (B) Loading areas should be visually unobtrusive and located to minimize conflicts with vehicles or pedestrians.**
- (C) Vehicular and pedestrian circulation on a site should be safe, efficient, and convenient for both pedestrians and drivers.**

The Planning Board noted that the DSP is in general conformance with the site design guidelines contained in Section 27-274 of the Zoning Ordinance, regarding provisions for safe and efficient on-site pedestrian and vehicular circulation, as well as provisions for adequate illumination. Specifically, the plan shows interior two-way travel lanes at 22 feet in width surrounding the building. The size of these travel lanes is large enough to provide safe parking, as well as through traffic that can travel in both directions.

There are 116 total parking spaces for the proposed hotel use. The vehicular access to the site is from a 28-foot-wide drive aisle, which provides two-way traffic to the site. This access intersects with Alaking Court, on the northwestern boundary of the site. A single loading space is provided on the eastern portion of the site and is safely located away from any pedestrian circulation on-site near the trash facilities. Parking spaces have been located at convenient locations, to allow customers to access the hotel building without compromising the vehicular circulation on-site, and offer a safe alternative for hotel guests.

(3) Lighting.

- (A) For uses permitting nighttime activities, adequate illumination should be provided. Light fixtures should enhance the design character.**

The Planning Board noted that the proposed light fixtures include pole mounted lighting in the parking area near the hotel and throughout the parking lot, providing a balanced lighting pattern throughout the property. The lighting placement has been designed to enhance the building entrances, pedestrian pathways, site design character, and to improve safety, while not causing a glare onto adjoining properties.

(4) Views.

- (A) Site design techniques should be used to preserve, create, or emphasize scenic views from public areas.**

The Planning Board noted that the DSP is designed to preserve, create, or emphasize views from the public roads and public spaces to the adjoining properties and green areas. The proposed buildings have been designed to provide a modern, clean, and appealing street presence along the roadways. This plan is designed to preserve, create, or emphasized views from the public roads that surround the property. The site has frontage on Alaking Court and can be seen from the Capital Beltway (I-95/495). The site plan is proposing a landscape strip or buffer along the road frontage of Alaking Court.

(5) Green Area.

- (A) On-site green area should be designed to complement other site activity areas and should be appropriate in size, shape, location, and design to fulfill its intended use.**

The Planning Board noted that the required green area for the I-1 Zone is 10 percent. This DSP complies with the design guidelines regarding green area for the Steeplechase Business Park and proposes 18 percent green area, exceeding the requirement. However, the Planning Board notes that, while the overall business park provides the required amount, the current application for Parcels 37 and 64 have not provided calculations on how this site can provide the required amount of green area independently. The plans should be revised to provide the green area for the subject site for permitting purposes. A condition has been included in this approval requiring the applicant to provide the green area for this application.

(6) Site and streetscape amenities.

- (A) Site and streetscape amenities should contribute to an attractive, coordinated development and should enhance the use and enjoyment of the site.**

The Planning Board noted that the applicant is not proposing any site or streetscape amenities as part of this hotel development. However, the DSP does propose a landscape strip along that road frontage of the property that contributes to an attractive, and coordinated development pattern of the streetscape bordering the site.

(7) Grading.

- (A) Grading should be performed to minimize disruption to existing topography and other natural and cultural resources on the site and on adjacent sites. To the extent practicable, grading should minimize environmental impacts.**

The Planning Board noted that the development is being proposed on a site that has been previously mass graded and the site is relatively flat. Minor fine grading will be required, but should be designed to minimize disruption to existing topography and other natural resources on the site and on adjacent properties.

(8) Service Areas.

- (A) Service areas should be accessible, but unobtrusive.**

The Planning Board noted that the DSP proposes loading areas on the northeastern side of the site, away from the building, and are screened by the location of the trash facilities and landscaping from the Capital Beltway (I-95/495).

(9) Public Spaces.

- (A) A public space system should be provided to enhance a large-scale commercial, mixed use, or multifamily development.**

The Planning Board noted that the DSP does not propose any public space in this development, but this application does propose several outdoor patio spaces which can be used by the occupants of the building.

(10) Architecture.

- (A) When architectural considerations are references for review, the Conceptual Site Plan should include a statement as to how the architecture of the buildings will provide a variety of building forms, with unified, harmonious use of materials and styles.**
- (B) The guidelines shall only be used in keeping with the character and purpose of the proposed type of development and the specific zone in which it is to be located.**
- (C) These guidelines may be modified in accordance with Section 27-277.**

The Planning Board noted that the proposed building includes a five-story building, which is 58 feet in height. The front of the hotel faces Alaking Court, while the rear of the building faces the Capital Beltway (I-95/495). The building has been designed to incorporate a variety of building materials, including cement board, glass, masonry, and stone veneer, into the building elevations on all sides of the structure and complements the surrounding uses. The building includes a series of canopies over the building entrances.

- 8. Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03113:** Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (PPS) 4-03113 was approved and adopted on March 11, 2004 (PGCPB Resolution No. 04-49). The Planning Board approved the PPS with 11 conditions. The conditions relevant to this application are discussed as follows:

- 3. Development of this property shall be in conformance to the approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan #8004290-2000-00.**

The Planning Board noted that a memorandum received from the Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement indicated that the DSP is consistent with the approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan, 8004290-2000.

- 4. An automatic fire suppression system shall be provided in all new buildings proposed in this subdivision, unless the Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department determines that an alternative method of fire suppression is appropriate or not required based on the use.**

The Planning Board noted that the subject DSP notes that all of the buildings will contain an automatic fire suppression system in accordance with this condition.

- 5. The master plan trail facility along Ritchie-Marlboro Road should be continued along the south side of the roadway in the vicinity of the subject site, in keeping with recent DPW&T road improvements in this area. Standard road frontage improvements to the subject site's frontage of Ritchie-Marlboro Road (including a**

standard sidewalk) are recommended at the time of street construction permits, per the concurrence of DPW&T.

The Planning Board noted that the master plan trail along the south side of Ritchie Marlboro Road has been completed east of Ritchie Station Court.

- 6. Ritchie Marlboro Road at site access (aka. Hampton Park Boulevard): Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements shall have full financial assurances, have been permitted for construction, and have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with DPW&T/SHA:**
 - a. Along Ritchie Marlboro Road/Walker Mill Road, provide a westbound right-turn lane and an eastbound left-turn lane.**
 - b. Along Hampton Park Boulevard at the approach to Ritchie Marlboro Road/Walker Mill Road, provide an exclusive right-turn lane and dual left-turn lanes.**
 - c. Provide the necessary traffic signal warrant studies and install a traffic signal at Ritchie Marlboro Road/Hampton Park Boulevard, if warranted, at the time it is deemed necessary by the responsible transportation agency.**

This condition has been reviewed by the Planning Board and it was determined that all improvements are complete and open to traffic.

- 8. The final plat shall deny direct access from Lots 14 through 20 onto I-95/I-495, Ritchie-Marlboro Road, and ramps connecting these two facilities.**

The Planning Board noted that Parcel 15 was recorded in Plat Book PM 225-68 on February 25, 2008. The record plat shows a denial of direct access from Lot 15 onto Ritchie Marlboro Road and the access ramp. The denial of access was maintained when Parcels 49 and 50 were resubdivided on September 5, 2013, as reflected on the current plat. This group of lots includes the subject parcel, and no rear access to the Capital Beltway (I-95/I-495), Ritchie Marlboro Road, or the ramp, connecting these facilities is shown. During the review process, the plans were revised to label that vehicular access is denied, as shown on Record Plat 54326.

- 9. Any abandoned well or septic system shall be pumped, backfilled and/or sealed in accordance with COMAR 26.04.04 by a licensed well driller or witnessed by a representative of the Health Department prior to final plat approval.**

The Planning Board noted that a final plat for Parcel 64 was recorded in Plat Book PM 224-44 on March 9, 2016. Similarly, Parcel 37 was recorded in Plat Book PM 232-33 on February 16, 2010.

10. The Developed Tier shall be the priority area for all off-site woodland conservation.

The Planning Board noted that the PPS and tree conservation plan were previously approved and have been reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section, as discussed in Finding 12 of this report. This condition has been met.

11. Prior to the approval of a building permit for Lot 4, a limited detailed site plan shall be approved by the Planning Board or its designee. The site plan shall examine architecture and views from the Capital Beltway.

The Planning Board noted a Detailed Site Plan DSP-16023 for Lot 4 was filed and approved as on December 1, 2016 (PGCPB Resolution No. 16-139). The DSP was submitted in accordance with this condition, and because the proposed building sits at approximately the same elevation as the Capital Beltway (I-95/495), the eastern elevation of the building will be highly visible. The application oriented the building such that, the eastern elevation is the front with multiple doors and storefront windows at the front of the tenant spaces, and placed a minimal amount of parking along the side of the building. Additionally, the application revised the architecture to add more brick to the eastern elevation and included a varied roofline with some cornice treatments at the entrance locations. This resulted in the side of the property facing the Capital Beltway being designed with minimal parking, the required landscaping, and an improved elevation with quality building materials, fenestration, and architectural details. The applicant's proposed plan and architecture in this DSP were found to be acceptable.

9. Detailed Site Plan DSP-05044 and its revisions: The subject site has an approved Detailed Site Plan, DSP-05044, which has been revised several times. The conditions attached to the approvals are discussed below.

a. Detailed Site Plan DSP-05044—The District Council approved the original DSP application on July 11, 2006, subject to seven conditions, which are discussed as follows:

1. Prior to certification of the DSP, a copy of the approved 100-year floodplain study shall be submitted for verification of the location of the proposed floodplain. All plans shall show the approved configuration of the proposed 100-year floodplain.

The Planning Board noted that the 100-year flood plain is shown on the submitted site plans; however, the 100-year floodplain will not be impacted by the current application and is located on the northernmost portion of Parcel 64.

2. Prior to certification of the DSP, the Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCP/128/90-03) shall be revised as follows:

a. Show the clear depiction of the phases on the cover sheet and provide a note regarding which phase is associated with each TCP revision.

- b. **Eliminate any encroachments into the regulated areas that were not previously approved; Show the required tree protection fencing and permanent afforestation/reforestation fencing and signage.**
 - c. **Provide a detail for the permanent afforestation fencing.**
 - d. **Show the proposed building and parking configurations for the current phase.**
 - e. **Consistently show all of the information on the TCPII on the DSP.**
 - f. **Revise the plan to eliminate Tree Conservation Area 1 shown on Sheet 4 of 14 because it is less than 2,500 square feet in area.**
 - g. **Provide a woodland conservation worksheet, which reflects all revisions made to the plan.**
 - h. **Provide a legend to show all symbols used on the plan on every sheet.**
 - i. **When all the revisions have been completed, have the plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.**
3. **Prior to certification of the DSP, a field investigation shall be conducted to verify the woodlands that remain on the site. The qualified professional shall verify this information and the preservation areas shown on the plans shall depict the woodlands that remain on-site.**

The environmental-related Conditions 2(a)–(i) and 3 were reviewed by the Planning Board, as discussed in Finding 12 of this approval, and were met prior to signature approval of DSP-05044.

4. **Prior to signature approval of the detailed site plan, provide a standard sidewalk along the subject site's entire frontage of Walker Mill Road extended and Ritchie-Marlboro Road, unless modified by DPW&T.**

The Planning Board noted that this sidewalk had not previously been provided on the nearby site's fronting on Ritchie Marlboro Road, between Hampton Park Boulevard and the Capital Beltway (I-95/495). At this location, it appears that pedestrian access is being provided through the interchange and under the Beltway via the master plan trail on the south side of Ritchie Marlboro Road; no sidewalk is provided in this vicinity on the north side. At this particular location, a sidewalk along the north side of the road would be isolated from the site by a decorative wall and only leads to the relatively high-speed ramp from the Beltway to Walker Mill Road. Based on these factors, the Planning Board does

not recommend sidewalk construction along the frontage of Ritchie Marlboro Road at this time.

5. **Prior to signature approval of the detailed site plan, the applicant shall:**
 - a. **Provide copies of the new storm water management plan demonstrating that Parcel D is no longer required and that there is no increase in the number of lots.**
 - b. **Revise the site bearings and distances to match the final plat with the detailed site plan.**

The Planning Board noted a revised Stormwater Management Concept Plan (8004290-2000-09). has been provided with the current application. Parcel D is no longer shown, and does not impact the current application. A final plat was recorded on April 5, 2005 at Plat Book 205, page 93.

6. **Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall file a new record plat to conform to the new detailed site plan.**

The Planning Board noted that Parcel 64 was recorded in Plat Book PM 224-44 on March 9, 2016. Similarly, Parcel 37 was recorded in Plat Book PM 232-33 on February 16, 2010.

7. **Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a detailed site plan of the individual pad sites of the retail portion of the office/warehouse for approval by the planning board.**

The Planning Board noted that the subject application is for a DSP for a hotel on Parcels 37 and 64 and, therefore, has satisfied this condition.

- b. **Detailed Site Plan DSP-05044-01—The District Council affirmed the Planning Board's approval (PGCPB Resolution No. 06-275) of this DSP revision application on July 23, 2007, subject to the following two conditions.**

1. **Prior to signature approval of the detailed site plan, provide a standard sidewalk along the subject site's entire frontage of Walker Mill Road extended and Ritchie Marlboro Road, unless modified by DPW&T.**

The Planning Board noted that a sidewalk had been constructed along the frontage of Walker Mill Road and Ritchie Marlboro Road, and this condition has been met.

2. **Revise the detailed site plan to remove the proposed landscaping shown within the right-of-way for the existing 54" water main.**

The Planning Board noted that the 54-inch watermain is located on the northern portion of this site. Parking and landscaping are proposed in this area and should be removed prior to certification. Therefore, this condition is still valid and has been added as a condition in this report.

- c. **Detailed Site Plan DSP-05044-02**—Detailed Site Plan DSP-05044-02 was approved by the Planning Board (PGCPB Resolution No. 09-111) in 2009, subject to two conditions, which are discussed as follows:

Prior to signature approval of the DSP, the landscape plan shall be revised to provide a dense evergreen screen around the sides and rear of the proposed dumpster enclosure, replacing the three deciduous trees currently shown on the plan. The evergreen trees shall be six to eight feet in height.

The Planning Board noted that this condition is specific to the dumpster enclosure in a different section of the Steeplechase business park, and does not affect the current application. It should be noted that this DSP application is proposing a dumpster enclosure constructed with a masonry material made to match the finish of the hotel, in addition to an evergreen screen around the facility.

2. **The building shall be equipped with a fire suppression system unless the Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department determines that an alternative method of fire suppression is more appropriate.**

The Planning Board noted that a general note on the current application has been provided to address fire suppression.

- d. **Detailed Site Plans DSP-05044-03 through DSP-05044-06**—Four other Planning Director-level revisions have been approved for minor site and architectural changes. These Planning Director-level approvals involved only minor revisions to other parcels within the Steeplechase Business Park retail area that do not affect the subject property.
- e. **Detailed Site Plan DSP-05044-07**—Detailed Site Plan DSP-05044-07 was approved for a multi-tenant retail building within the retail area of Steeplechase Business Park and the resolution (PGCPB Resolution No. 15-01) was adopted by the Planning Board on January 8, 2014, subject to three conditions, which are discussed as follows:
1. **Prior to certification, the applicant shall revise the plans as follows or provide the specified documentation:**
- a. **Revise the Tree Canopy Coverage schedule to correctly reflect the areas shown on the approved Type II tree conservation plan (TCPII).**

The Planning Board noted that the previous plans were revised and certified, showing the correct areas. The TCP2 and DSP will be reviewed with the current application and provide the correct areas.

- b. Provide a plan note that indicates conformance to construction activity dust control requirements as specified in the 2011 Maryland Standards and Specifications for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control.**

The Planning Board found that a note is shown on the site plan for the current application, this condition has been met.

- c. The landscape plan shall show conformance with Section 1.7(b) of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*, providing certification of landscape maintenance pursuant to that section.**

The Planning Board noted that Parcels 37 and 64 are currently vacant and do not show any existing landscaping, therefore, this condition is not valid for these parcels.

- d. Show and label denial of access to Ritchie-Marlboro Road, Alaking Court, and Hampton Park Boulevard for Parcels 49 and 50 on Sheets C-4 and C-9, except at the location of the shared vehicular access easement.**

The Planning Board noted that Parcel 15 was recorded in Plat Book PM 225-68 on February 25, 2008. The record plat shows a denial of direct access from Lot 15 onto Ritchie Marlboro Road and the access ramp. The denial of access was maintained when Parcels 49 and 50 were resubdivided on September 5, 2013, as reflected on the current plat. The current application is for Parcels 37 and 64. Parcels 49 and 50 are not part of this application, and therefore, this condition is not valid for the subject application. It should be noted that a note has been added to the current application that shows a denial of access to the Capital Beltway (I-95/495).

- e. Show the shared vehicular access on Parcels 49 and 50 as reflected in the Termination of Certain Easements Granted under Declaration of Covenants, Conditions, Restrictions and Easements recorded in Liber 35421 at Folio 17 of the Prince George's County Land Records, with liber/folio reference.**

The Planning Board noted that the current application is for Parcels 37 and 64. Parcels 49 and 50 are not part of this application, and therefore this condition is not valid for the subject application.

- f. **Remove the Section 4.3-1 Landscape schedule from the landscape plan.**

The Planning Board noted that this condition is not valid for the subject application, and the schedule not be removed. Section 4.3-1 of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*, requires parking lots within 30 feet of the property line in the Developing Tier provide a five-foot-wide landscape strip between the parking lot and any adjacent property line, and is applicable to the subject application.

2. **Prior to approval of any building permits for Parcel 49, a final plat shall be approved by the Prince George's County Planning Board in accordance with Section 24-111 of the Subdivision Regulations to authorize the use of a private easement for vehicular access pursuant to Section 24-128(b)(9). The final plat shall reflect the location of the shared vehicular access easement, with liber/folio reference, and denial of access in conformance with the detailed site plan.**

The Planning Board noted that Parcel 49 was recorded in Plat Book PM 238-98 on September 5, 2013. The record plat shows a private easement for vehicular access; however, the current application is for Parcels 37 and 64. Parcels 49 and 50 are not part of this application, and therefore this condition is not valid for the subject application.

3. **The following note shall be placed on the final plat:**

"Vehicular access for Parcels 49 and 50 is provided via a shared vehicular access easement, pursuant to Section 24-128(b)(9) of the Subdivision Regulations."

The Planning Board noted that the current application is for Parcels 37 and 64. Parcels 49 and 50 are not part of this application, and therefore this condition is not valid for the subject application.

The 2010 Glenn Dale-Seabrook-Lanham Sector Plan and SMA maintained the I-1 Zone on the subject property.

10. **2010 Prince George's County Landscape Manual:** The application is subject to Section 4.2, Requirements for Landscape Strips Along Streets; Section 4.3, Parking Lot Requirements; and Section 4.9, Sustainable Landscaping Requirements of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* (Landscape Manual).

- a. An ancillary communication tower and sewer pump station currently exist on Outlot A, which is owned by the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC). This Outlot is not part of this application, however, it is accessed by a drive aisle and easement, which

are within the property boundary of the subject application. A condition has been added to this approval requiring the applicant to clearly label this use and the access easement for Outlot A.

Additionally, the public utility use is compatible with the current application and is regarded as a medium impact, similar to the hotel proposed with this application, and is not subject to a Section 4.7 landscape bufferyard.

- b. **Section 4.2, Requirements for Landscape Strips Along Streets**—The site is subject to Section 4.2 along its southeastern property line where it abuts the Capital Beltway (I-95/495) and along Alaking Court on its northern property line. Section 4.2 requires a minimum 10-foot-wide landscape strip to be planted with a minimum of 1 shade tree and 10 shrubs per every 35 linear feet of road frontage in the Developing Tier.

The road frontage along the Capital Beltway is approximately 492 feet, and the plans have provided a dimension to reflect this distance. However, the schedule for this frontage indicates that Option 2 has been selected to provide conformance. Option 2 requires a minimum 10-foot-wide landscape strip with an average of fifteen feet in width to be planted with a minimum of one shade tree and five shrubs per every 35 linear feet of road frontage in the Developing Tier. The Planning Board notes that the site plan shows more than the required amount and meets the requirements for the frontage in this area.

The road frontage along Alaking Court is approximately 265 feet, however, and the plan incorrectly labels this frontage as Section 2.4 and Section 4.7, and does not show the required plant material for the frontage. The plans are required to provide eight shade trees and 76 shrubs. The schedule and site plan should be updated prior to the certification to reflect the correct label and the required number of plants. A condition has been included in this approval, to revise the plans and schedule to show the correct labels and required number of plants for this application.

- c. **Section 4.3, Parking Lot Requirements**—The site is subject to Section 4.3 of the Landscape Manual, specifically Sections 4.3-1 and 4.3-2.

Section 4.3-1 of the Landscape Manual, requires parking lots within 30 feet of the property line in the Developed Tier provide a three-foot-wide landscape strip between the parking lot and any adjacent property line, and should be planted with 15 shrubs for every 35 linear feet of parking lot. This application includes 49 feet of frontage along the parking lot on the eastern side of the site bordering the Capital Beltway and appears to provide the required amount of plant material.

Section 4.3-2 of the Landscape Manual stipulates that interior parking lot planting is required for parking areas that measure 7,000 square feet or larger. The application proposes a parking area of 44,047 square feet and is required to provide and interior

landscape area of 8 percent, or 3,524 square feet. The landscape plan appears to meet this requirement and proposes to include more internal planting area than that is required.

- d. **Section 4.9, Sustainable Landscaping Requirements**—Section 4.9 requires that a certain percentage of plants within each plant type (including shade trees, ornamental trees, evergreen trees, and shrubs) be native species (or the cultivars of native species). The minimum percentage of each plant type required to be native species and/or native species cultivars is specified below:

Tree type	Required	Provided
Shade trees	50%	55%
Ornamental trees	50%	50%
Evergreen trees,	30%	80%
Shrubs	30%	57%

The plans demonstrate conformance with the above requirements.

11. **Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance:** The site is subject to the provisions of the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance (WCO) because the property is greater than 40,000 square feet in size, and because it has previously approved Type I and Type II tree conservation plans associated with it. A revised Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII-128-90-11) has been submitted with the subject application. The plan requires minor revisions to be in conformance with the WCO. The full proposed development must be shown on Parcels 37 and 64 and must match what is shown on the DSP.

The woodland conservation threshold for this 110.28-acre property is 15 percent of the net tract area, or 14.97 acres. The total woodland conservation requirement, based on the amount of clearing proposed, is 26.00 acres. This requirement is proposed to be satisfied with 1.87 acres of on-site preservation, 6.73 acres of on-site reforestation, 16.70 acres of off-site mitigation credits, and 0.70 acre of fee-in-lieu.

A Natural Resources Inventory Equivalency Letter, NRI-095-2017, was approved on May 4, 2017.

12. **Prince George's County Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance**—Subtitle 25, Division 3, the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance, requires a minimum percentage of tree canopy coverage (TCC) on projects that require a grading permit or propose more than 5,000 square feet or greater of disturbance. Properties that are zoned I-1 are required to provide a minimum of 10 percent of the gross tract area in TCC. This project has 2.79 acres in the I-1 Zone, which results in a required TCC of 0.27 acre for the site, or 11,761 square feet.

This DSP application is calculated for the overall Steeplechase Business Park and includes landscaping that has been proposed on the subject property, resulting in more than what is required for the subject property, meeting the requirements of the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance.

During the Planning Boarding hearing, an alternative condition was discussed by the Planning Board to revise the language of Condition 1n. to state, "Revise the Tree Canopy Coverage schedule to show conformance with the Tree Canopy Ordinance." The revised language was approved and adopted by the Planning Board to replace the original condition and is included in this resolution.

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

- a. **Community Planning**—The Planning Board noted the following:

General Plan: This application is consistent with the *Plan Prince George's 2035 Approved General Plan*.

Master Plan: The 2010 *Approved Subregion 4 Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* recommends industrial land uses for the subject property.

Aviation/M-I-O Zone: The property is not impacted by the Military Installation Overlay (M-I-O) Zone

SMA/Zoning: The 2010 *Approved Subregion 4 Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* retained the I-1 Zone.

Planning Issues: There are no master plan issues associated with this application.

- b. **Subdivision Review**—The Planning Board noted the following:

The subject property is composed of Parcels 37 and 64, Steeplechase Business Park. The property is located on Tax Map 74 in Grid C-3, C-4, D-3, D-4, E-3 and E-4, is currently undeveloped and is approximately 2.79 acres in size. The purpose of this DSP is to construct a 74,489-square-foot, 5-story hotel with approximately 123 rooms. The property was recorded in Plat Book PM 232-33 on February 16, 2010, and Plat Book SJH 244-44 on March 9, 2016 for Parcels 37 and 64, respectively. The bearings and distances shown on the submitted DSP are consistent with the underlying record plats.

The property is the subject of PPS 4-03113, which was approved on March 4, 2004 (PGCPB Resolution No. 04-49) for 28 lots, 4 parcels, and 1 outparcel on 110.23 acres in the I-1 Zone. The resolution was adopted by the Planning Board on March 11, 2004. The resolution contains 11 conditions. The following conditions below relate to the review of the subject DSP application:

2. **Prior to the issuance of permits a Type II Tree Conservation Plan shall be approved.**

Conformance to the TCPII should be reviewed and determined by the Environmental Planning Section.

3. **Development of this property shall be in conformance to the approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan No. 8004290-2000-00.**

General Note 14 of the DSP indicates that Stormwater Management Concept Plan 8004290-2000-06 was approved on May 6, 2008.

4. **An automatic fire suppression system shall be provided in all new buildings proposed in this subdivision, unless the Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department determines that an alternative method of fire suppression is appropriate.**

General Note 17 on the DSP indicates that an automatic fire suppression system will be provided in all new buildings in this subdivision.

5. **The master plan trail facility along Ritchie Marlboro Road should be continued along the south side of the roadway in the vicinity of the subject site, in keeping with recent DPW&T road improvements in this area. Standard road frontage improvements to the subject site's frontage of Ritchie Marlboro Road (including a standard sidewalk) are recommended at the time of street construction permits, per the concurrence of DPW&T.**

The parcels that are the subject of the current DSP revision front on the Capital Beltway and Alaking Court, which is fully constructed. Neither of the two parcels have frontage along Ritchie Marlboro Road.

10. **The Developed Tier shall be the priority area for all off-site woodland conservation.**

Conformance to Condition 10 should be reviewed and determined by the Environmental Planning Section.

Plan Comments

- (1) The applicant should obtain consent from the Potomac Electric Power Company and WSSC for construction of the proposed parking compound within their easements.
- (2) Revise Sheet C-11 of the submitted plan to show that vehicular access along the Capital Beltway is denied per Record Plat 54326.

- (3) The construction of the proposed parking compound appears to be unfinished along the southwest side of the Parcel 37 and it is unclear as to what is being proposed in this area. The edge of pavement is proposed to stop well short of the southwest property line, and no curb and gutter is proposed along the pavement edge within this area. The plans should be revised to clarify what is being proposed in this area.
- (4) A general note should be added to the DSP that references the underlying PPS and record plats.
- (5) The ingress/egress easement for abutting Outlot A should be clearly labeled on Sheet C-11 of the submitted plans.

c. **Transportation Planning**—The Planning Board reviewed the DSP application for Steeplechase and noted the following:

The Transportation Planning Section has reviewed the site plan noted above. The subject site consists of approximately 2.79 acres of land in the I-1 Zone. The property is located south and east of Alaking Court, adjacent to the Capital Beltway (I-95/495) and approximately 1,400 feet east of its intersection with Hampton Park Boulevard. The applicant is proposing a 123-room hotel.

Review Comments

The site is subject to the general requirements of site plan review, which include attention to parking, loading, on-site circulation, etc. No traffic-related findings are required.

The two parcels are located within a portion of the Steeplechase Business Park. The site is served by a single driveway from Alaking Court. The plan appears to also include access to adjacent Parcel 35, on which a sit-down restaurant is being proposed. This site access is acceptable and desirable.

There are several conditions on Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03113 which have been addressed. The status of the transportation-related conditions is summarized below:

Condition 6: This condition requires improvements to the Ritchie Marlboro Road/Hampton Park Boulevard intersection. All improvements are complete and open to traffic.

Condition 7: This condition requires dedication along Hampton Park Boulevard within the subject property. This dedication is complete, and Hampton Park Boulevard is open to traffic through the subject property.

Condition 8: This condition denies access to the rear of a number of lots. This group of lots includes the subject parcel, and no rear access to the Capital Beltway (I-95/495), Ritchie Marlboro Road, or the ramp connecting these facilities is shown.

Although there is no trip cap condition, the resolution approving the subdivision includes a clear finding that the approval considered 1,120 AM and 1,167 PM peak-hour trips. The Planning Board's analysis indicates that the following has been constructed, approved, or planned for the site in consideration of the square footage proposed by this plan:

USE	AM	PM
850,927 square feet of industrial space on Parcels 1, 22, 39, 40, 41, 53, 54, 55 and 61 (assume 20% office and 80% warehouse per permit plans) constructed	559	541
34,586 square feet of industrial space (30,000 square feet office and remainder warehouse) planned.	41	35
Convenience Store with Gas Pumps (12 fueling positions) with 66% pass by	76	79
59,588 square feet of retail (computed per Guidelines).	68	254
123-room hotel CURRENT APPLICATION	69	73
6,599 square feet fast food restaurant with 49% AM/50% PM pass by	153	108
TOTAL EXISTING, PROPOSED, AND PLANNED	966	1,090
TRIP CAP PER 4-03113	1120	1,167

As shown in the table above, existing, proposed, and planned development remains within the trip cap established by the PPS. This includes all pending and approved, but unbuilt, applications within the area of PPS 4-03113.

It shall be noted that future applications within the development are likely to bring the site near the trip cap. A more detailed review of trip generation will need to be conducted with the next application in order to verify uses and to ensure that internal trip satisfaction is properly included in the trip generation analysis (it has not been factored into the above analysis).

Summary

As noted above, no traffic-related (or adequacy-related) findings are associated with DSP review. In summary, the Planning Board notes that the site plan is acceptable.

- d. **Trails**—The Planning Board reviewed the DSP application referenced above for conformance with the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* (MPOT) and/or the appropriate area master/sector plan in order to implement planned trails, bikeways, and pedestrian improvements. It was noted that:

The subject application proposes a 123-room hotel in the I-1 Zone within the Steeplechase Business Park. Parcels 37 and 38 are between Alaking Court and the Capital Beltway (I-95/495). The site is covered by the MPOT and the 2010 *Approved Subregion 4 Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (area master plan).

The Complete Streets section of the MPOT includes the following policies regarding sidewalk construction and the accommodation of pedestrians.

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

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

The construction of a standard sidewalk along the site's entire frontage of Alaking Court, as shown on the site plan should be completed. Additionally, a sidewalk connection shall link the sidewalk along Alaking Court with the sidewalk around the hotel. No additional sidewalk connections are necessary. A small amount of bicycle parking is required.

Conclusion

In conformance with the MPOT and the area master plan, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall make the following revisions to the plans prior to certification:

- (1) Provide a bicycle rack accommodating a minimum of five bicycles. A detail for the rack shall be included with the site plan.
- (2) Provide a standard sidewalk along the subject site's entire frontage of Alaking Court, unless modified by the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T).

The Planning Board has reviewed the transportation-related requirements and has included them as conditions in this approval.

- e. **Environmental Planning**—The Planning Board reviewed the environmental-related conditions and found the following:

- (1) **Site Description:** The overall property is located in the northwest quadrant of the intersection of the Capital Beltway (I-95/495) and Ritchie Marlboro Road. The surrounding properties are commercial and industrially zoned except to the east of I-95/495, that is residentially zoned. The site drains into unnamed tributaries of the Southwest Branch watershed in the Patuxent River basin. The predominant

soils found to occur on the overall site according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS), Web Soil Survey (WSS) include the Adelphia-Holmdel, Collington-Wist-Urban land, Croom-Marr, Donlonton fin sandy loam, Shrewsbury loam, and Widewater and Issue soils. According to available information, Marlboro clay and Christiana complexes are not found to occur on this property. According to information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Natural Heritage Program, there are no rare, threatened, or endangered species found to occur on or in the vicinity of this property. There are streams, floodplain and wetlands associated with the overall site. The site is abutting the Capital Beltway (I-95/495), which is a source of significant traffic generated noise. The overall site fronts on Ritchie Marlboro Road, a master plan designated historic roadway; however, the property within the subject application does not. The site contains a Regulated Area within the designated network of the 2005 *Approved Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan*. The site is located within the Established Communities of the Growth Policy Map and Environmental Strategy Area 1 (formerly the Developed Tier) of the Regulated Environmental Protection Areas Map as designated by *Plan Prince George's 2035 Approved General Plan*.

- (2) **Review of Previously Approved Conditions:** The following text addresses previously approved environmental conditions related to the subject application. The text in **BOLD** is the actual text from the previous cases or plans. The plain text provides the comments on the plan's conformance with the conditions.

Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03113:

1. **Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan:**
 - b. **The preliminary plan and the TCPI shall be revised to eliminate PMA Impact Areas 6. The proposed building layout shown on the TCPI for proposed Lots 21 and 22 shall be further evaluated to ensure that impacts to the PMA in this area do not occur.**
 - c. **The FSD shall be revised to reflect the correct acreages on-site in total and for each stand.**
 - d. **TCPI/34/00 shall be revised as follows:**
 - (1) **Provide the correct acreage of existing woodland on-site.**
 - (2) **Provide evidence of DER's approval for reforestation areas in stormwater management ponds.**

- (3) **Revise the computation worksheet as necessary after the other revisions have been made.**
 - (4) **When all the revisions have been completed, have the plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.**
2. **Prior to the issuance of permits a Type II Tree Conservation Plan shall be approved.**
3. **Development of this property shall be in conformance to the approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan No. 8004290-2000-00.**

The Planning Board noted that all environmental-related conditions were met prior to signature approval of the PPS. No additional information is required for conformance.

Detailed Site Plan DSP-05044:

1. **Prior to certification of the DSP, a copy of the approved 100-year floodplain study shall be submitted for verification of the location of the proposed floodplain. All plans shall show the approved configuration of the proposed 100-year floodplain.**
2. **Prior to certification of the DSP, the Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCP II/128/90-03) shall be revised as follows:**
 - a. **Show the clear depiction of the phases on the cover sheet and provide a note regarding which phase is associated with each TCP II revision.**
 - b. **Eliminate any encroachments into the regulated areas that were not previously approved; Show the required tree protection fencing and permanent afforestation/reforestation fencing and signage.**
 - c. **Provide a detail for the permanent afforestation fencing.**
 - d. **Show the proposed building and parking configurations for the current phase.**
 - e. **Consistently show all of the information on the TCP II on the DSP.**

- f. **Revise the plan to eliminate Tree Conservation Area 1 shown on Sheet 4 of 14 because it is less than 2,500 square feet in area.**
 - g. **Provide a woodland conservation worksheet, which reflects all revisions made to the plan.**
 - h. **Provide a legend to show all symbols used on the plan on every sheet.**
 - i. **When all the revisions have been completed, have the plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.**
3. **Prior to certification of the DSP, a field investigation shall be conducted to verify the woodlands that remain on the site. The qualified professional shall verify this information and the preservation areas shown on the plans shall depict the woodlands that remain on-site.**

The Planning Board noted that all environmental-related conditions were met prior to signature approval of the DSP. No additional information is required for conformance.

- (3) **Environmental Review:** As revisions are made to the plans submitted, the revision boxes on each plan sheet shall be used to describe what revisions were made, when, and by whom.
- (4) **Natural Resources Inventory/Existing Conditions:** An approved and signed Natural Resource Inventory Equivalency Letter, NRI-095-2017, which was approved on May 4, 2017, was submitted. No revisions are required for conformance to the NRI.
- (5) **Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance:** The site is subject to the provisions of the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance because it has previously approved Type I and Type II tree conservation plans associated with it. A revised Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII-128-90-11) has been submitted with the subject application.

The plan requires minor revisions to be in conformance with the Woodland Conservation Ordinance. The full proposed development must be shown on Parcel 37 and must match what is shown on the DSP.

The woodland conservation threshold for this 110.28-acre property is 15 percent of the net tract area or 14.97 acres. The total woodland conservation requirement based on the amount of clearing proposed is 26.00 acres. This requirement is proposed to be satisfied with 1.87 acres of on-site preservation and 6.73 acres of on-site reforestation, 16.70 acres of off-site mitigation credits, and 0.70 acre of fee-in-lieu. A note should be added below the worksheet to document the recordation information for the off-site credit easements; 11.92 acres have been provided at Liber 20357 folio 217, and 7.10 acres have been provided at Liber 20260 folio 026. A second note should be added below the worksheet to document the payment of the fee-in-lieu, which was paid with Permit 38320-2013-G-03.

No color copies of the plan are needed for reporting purposes because there are no changes from the previously captured version of the plan.

Conditions

Prior to certification of the DSP, the Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCP/II-128-90-11) shall be revised as follows:

- (a) The TCP shall show the final site layout matching what is shown on the DSP.
- (b) The following notes shall be added below the TCP worksheet:
 - i. The off-site woodland conservation requirements have been met at Liber 20357 folio 217 and Liber 20260 folio 026.
 - ii. The woodland conservation fee-in-lieu of \$9,147.60 was paid with Permit 38320-2013-G-03.
- (6) **Primary Management Area:** Section 27-285(b)(4) of the Zoning Ordinance requires the following finding:

“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).”

A statement of justification was submitted and reviewed as part of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03113. No new impacts are being proposed with the current application, therefore no new statement of justification is needed.

Finding

The regulated environmental features on the subject property have been preserved and/or restored in a natural state to the fullest extent possible based on the evaluation provided with Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03113.

- (7) **Stormwater Management:** An approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan and Letter (8004290-2000-09) were submitted with the subject application. The plan shows the use of existing ponds, underground storage, micro-bioretenion, gravel wetland and storm filter facilities for the overall property.

The Planning Board noted that the environmental-related conditions have either been addressed or have been worded as conditions in this approval.

- f. **Historic Preservation**—The Planning Board noted the following:

The subject property comprises 2.79 acres located between Alaking Court and Capital Beltway (I-95/495) in Capitol Heights, Maryland. The site is currently unimproved and is bounded by Alaking Court to the north, an existing vacant lot to the west and the Capital Beltway to the east and south. The subject application proposes a hotel with a total gross floor area of approximately 74,489 square feet. The subject property is zoned I-1.

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 was previously graded. The subject property does not contain and is not adjacent to any Prince George's County historic sites or resources. This proposal will not impact any historic sites, historic resources, or known archeological sites. Phase I archeology survey is not recommended.

- g. **Permit Review**—The Planning Board finds that the permit-related comments have been either addressed during the review process or are worded as conditions in this approval.
- h. **Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department**—The Fire/EMS Department did not offer any comments on the subject project.
- i. **Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE)**—In a memorandum dated August 29, 2017, DPIE offered numerous comments. Those comments have been provided to the applicant and will be addressed under DPIE's separate permitting process.
- j. **Prince George's County Police Department**—The Police Department did not offer any comments on the subject project.
- k. **Prince George's County Health Department**—The Health Department did not offer any comments on the subject project.

- l. **Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)**—In an e-mail dated July 12, 2017, WSSC offered numerous comments regarding the provision of water and sewer to the development. These comments have been provided to the applicant and will be addressed through WSSC's separate permitting process.
 - m. **Verizon**—Verizon did not offer any comments on the subject project.
 - n. **Potomac Electric Power Company (PEPCO)**—PEPCO did not offer any comments on the subject project.
14. Based on the foregoing and as required by Section 27-285(b)(1), this DSP 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. As required by Section 27-285(b)(4) of the Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Board must also find that the regulated environmental features on a site have been preserved and/or restored in a natural state to the fullest extent possible in accordance with the requirements of Subtitle 24-130(b)(5). In their memorandum dated July 17, 2017, the Environmental Planning Section noted that the regulated environmental features on the subject property have been preserved and/or restored in a natural state to the fullest extent possible.

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 Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII-128-90-11, and further APPROVED Detailed Site Plan DSP-05044-08 for the above described land, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Prior to certificate approval of the detailed site plan (DSP), the applicant shall revise the DSP to:
 - a. Remove the proposed parking spaces and landscaping shown within the right-of-way of the existing 54-inch water main on Parcel 64.
 - b. Provide the green area for the subject site including Parcels 37 and 64 for permit purposes.
 - c. Provide the correct labels and required number of plants on the plans and in the schedule for the subject application, in accordance with Sections 4.2 and 4.7 of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*.
 - d. Provide a bicycle rack accommodating a minimum of five bicycles and a detail for the bicycle rack.

- e. Provide a standard sidewalk along the subject site's entire frontage of Alaking Court, unless modified by the Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation.
- f. Clearly label the access easement and ownership for the public utility use on Outlot A.
- g. Revise Sheet C-11 of the submitted plan to show that vehicular access along the Capital Beltway (I-95/495) is denied per Record Plat 54326.
- h. Clarify what is being proposed on the parking lot along the southwest side of Parcel 37, no edge of pavement or curb and gutter is proposed.
- i. Add a general note to the DSP referencing the underlying preliminary plan of subdivision and record plats.
- j. Label the ingress/egress easement for abutting Outlot A.
- k. Revise the cover sheet of the DSP (C-1) to reflect "DSP-05044-08," not "DSP-05044-06."
- l. Add the building dimensions to the DSP (C-11).
- m. Revise the Tree Canopy Coverage schedule to show conformance to the Tree Canopy Ordinance.
- n. Clarify the location of the sign shown on sheet A590, Item 5 Building Signage.
- o. Provide the sign setbacks for the monument sign, pursuant to Section 27-614(a) of the Zoning Ordinance.
- p. Provide the method of erecting the building sign, pursuant to Section 27-596(c)(4) of the Zoning Ordinance.
- q. Reflect the total building gross floor area on C-11 not the "ground floor GFA."
- r. Reflect the actual building height of 55.27 feet on Sheet C-1.
- s. Clearly note the width of the landscape strip on Sheet 14B of the landscape plan, along the Capital Beltway (I-95/495).
- t. Revise Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPH-128-90-11 to show the final site layout, matching what is shown on the DSP.
- u. Reflect the permitted and provided number of compact parking spaces in the parking calculation.

- w. Revise the entrance sign from a pylon sign to a nine-foot-tall monument sign.


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 Geraldo, seconded by Commissioner Bailey, with Commissioners Geraldo, Bailey, Doerner, and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioner Washington absent at its regular meeting held on Thursday, September 21, 2017, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.


Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 19th day of October 2017.

Elizabeth M. Hewlett
Chairman

By 
Jessica Jones
Planning Board Administrator

EMH:JJ:NAB:yw

APPROVED AS TO LEGAL SUFFICIENCY


M-NCP&C Legal Department

Date 10/3/17