

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, 2006, regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-06001 for The Commons at Addison Road Metro, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The application is for the purpose of reviewing the development of 170 multifamily units and 22,696 square feet of commercial with an underground parking structure in the portion of the Addison Road Metro Town Center, known as Metro West (town commons). The detailed site plan approval is required by the sector plan and consists of a site plan, landscape and lighting plan, and architectural elevations.
2. **Development Data Summary**

	<b>EXISTING</b>	<b>PROPOSED</b>
Zone(s)	C-S-C	C-S-C
Use(s)	Vacant	Multifamily units
Acreage	1.94	1.94
Lots	6	1
Square Footage/GFA	0	22,696 SF commercial 252,304 SF residential
FAR proposed	0	3.25 FAR
Total Dwelling Units:	0	170
Single family detached	0	0
Single family attached	0	0
Multifamily units	0	170

### Other Development Data

3. **Location:** The subject property is located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Central

Number of bedrooms	Square footage range	Number of units
1 bedroom	815-855	42
2 bedroom	1,175-1,343	108
2 bedroom with den	1,613	6
3 bedroom	1,548	14

  

Parking Required	Number of Spaces
Commercial 1/250 (50%)	45.4
Residential	
1 bedroom-42 units @ 1.33/unit	55.9
2 bedroom-108 units @ 1.66/unit	179.3
2 bedroom with den-6 units @ 1.99/unit	11.4
3 bedroom-14 units @ 1.99/unit	27.9
Total parking required	320
Total parking provided	328
Surface parking proposed	40
Structured parking proposed	288
Handicap required	8
Handicap provided	7

Avenue (MD 214) and Addison Road. The property is directly across Addison Road from the Addison Road Metro Station. The property is within the subarea of Metro West (town commons), of the Addison Road Metro Town Center.

4. **Surroundings:** To the north of the subject property, across Central Avenue, is an existing gas station. To the east, across Addison Road, is the Addison Road Metro Station. To the west across Zelma Road are residential properties in the R-55 Zone. To the south are residentially-zoned and commercially-zoned properties.
5. **Previous Approvals:** The property is the subject of Preliminary Plan 4-05068, approved by the Planning Board on February 9, 2006, pursuant to PGCPB Resolution No. 06-37. The development proposal stated in the preliminary plan resolution is for 162 multifamily dwelling units and 24,500 square feet of commercial development. The proposal shown on the detailed site plan is revised and proposes 170 dwelling units and 22,696 square feet of commercial development.

6. **Design Features:** The proposed development is composed of a single multiuse building. The plan proposes commercial uses (retail and office) on the first floor, residential amenities and residential units on the second floor, and residential units on floors three through eight. The plan proposes two access points into the development, the primary access from Addison Road and a secondary access point from Zelma Avenue. The majority of parking is proposed in a parking structure under the building, access being from the rear of the building. Surface parking is proposed along Addison Road, along MD 214, and at the rear of the building where loading facilities are also located.

The building is eight stories high with the first floor all commercial uses. The anticipated uses include office, retail, a bank, and a number of restaurants. The first floor also includes the main lobby for the residential units above. The second floor includes the residential amenities and 20 residences. The amenities on the second floor include a lounge/billiard area, a fitness center, a separate fitness aerobic area, a sauna, a business area, a media center, and men's and women's shower/dressing rooms. Floors three through eight are completely residential units. Another recreational area is proposed on the rooftop. The outdoor recreational area includes a 60-foot by 25-foot-wide (1,500 square feet) pool, a picnic area, and two gazebo sitting areas. Landscaping and a shade structure are also proposed.

The exterior finish materials of the building include tan-colored split-face concrete masonry with textured and smooth bands from the base of the building through the second floor. Above the second floor is a reddish-colored brick through the seventh floor and a lighter tan-colored brick at the top of the building. The roof of the main building is flat. Standing seam metal roofs in a dark green color are proposed on architectural accent portions of the building and a parapet surrounds the remaining portion of the building. Canvas canopy awnings are proposed on the first floor, and a steel and tempered glass structure roof canopy is proposed at the main entrance. Recessed 4-foot-deep by 4-to 17-foot-wide balconies are proposed for some units.

Signage is proposed with freestanding and building-mounted signage. In addition, the architectural elevations propose the name of the building on the front of the building at the eighth floor.

#### COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. A property owner can request an amendment to the Development District Overlay Zone as allowed under Section 27-548.09.01. The applicant submitted the following justification statement to support the proposed changes to the use list, which describes the amendments and provides crucial aspects of the zoning ordinance for conformance:

“The subject property is located within the town commons, subarea 3 - Metro West portion of the Addison Road Metro (ARM) Center. Specifically, the property is located in the southwest quadrant of MD 214 and Addison Road South, east of Zelma Avenue. The property is located on Tax Map 73, Grid C-1, and is known as Parcels 86 and 377, and Lots 1-4, Block B, Kings Seat Pleasant Subdivision, recorded in land records in 1949 (WWW 16

@61). The Property is approximately 1.93± acres and zoned C-S-C and is currently vacant (“Property”).

“Section 27-548.26(b) (1) (B) of the Zoning Ordinance allows property owners located within a Development District to request changes to the underlying zones or the list of allowed uses, as modified by the Development District Standards. (Underlining added for emphasis). According to the permitted use table in the ARM plan, dwelling units (located above the first floor) within a building containing commercial uses, which is 4 or more stories in height, are not permitted and neither is an outdoor swimming pool. As the applicant intends to provide dwelling units below the fourth floor and an outdoor rooftop swimming pool, an amendment of the use table in the ARM plan is required. The requirements for the approval of a site plan for development in a DDOZ zone can be found in Section 27-548.25

**“Section 27-548.26**

**“Sec. 27-548.26. Amendment of Approved Development District Overlay Zone**

**“(B) An owner of property in the Development District may request changes to the underlying zones or the list of allowed uses, as modified by the Development District Standards;**

“Comment: The purpose of this application is to change the list of allowed uses in the ARM plan to permit dwelling units (above the first floor) in a building containing commercial uses, which is 4 or more stores in height. Additionally, the applicant is requesting that the list of allowed uses be further amended to allow an outdoor rooftop swimming pool.

**“(5) The District Council may approve, approve with conditions, or disapprove any amendment request by a property owner under this Section. In approving an application and site plan, the District Council shall find that the proposed development conforms with the purposes and recommendation for the Development District, as stated in the Master Plan, Master Plan Amendment, or the Sector Plan, and meets applicable site plan requirements.**

“Comment: It should be noted that the proposed development conforms to the purposes and recommendations for the Development District, as stated in the Addison Road Metro Town Center Sector Plan. The ARM plan sets out four primary goals or purposes. These four goals emphasize the need for revitalization of the area and the need to accommodate the users of the Metro station and pedestrians. The sector plan summary states the following purposes:

**“The chief single purpose of the sector plan is to maximize the public benefits from the Addison Road Metro Station. Built on a widened and improved Central Avenue, the Addison Road station represents years of transportation**

**planning and construction and millions of dollars of public investment. The station connects the Arm Town Center to the many employment, shopping, recreation, and business opportunities available to users of the Washington Metro System.**

**“The sector plan sets out four primary goals:**

- “1. Revitalize the town center with new, upscale residential and commercial development. The entire town center area is in need of revitalization to attract new business and residents.**

“Comment: As noted above, the Property is located within the town commons, subarea 3–Metro West portion of the Addison Road Metro (ARM) Center. The Sector Plan proposes the town commons for the most compact mix of uses: moderate to high-density residential development, nearby commercial businesses serving residents and Metro users, and a continuous network of narrowed streets oriented to pedestrians. It also encourages a vertical mix of uses. (See pages 90, 166-168 of the Sector Plan). Along the main street of the Town Commons, Addison Road and MD 214, office and/or residential uses are desired above ground floor retail. The applicant proposal is consistent with this recommendation as it contemplates the construction of an 8 story building with approximately 23, 000 square feet of retail/commercial uses on the ground level, with 7 stories of luxury condominiums offering 1, 2 and 3 bedroom units. Moreover, the General Plan identifies the Property as part of the Developed Tier and the Addison Road Metro Station as a Community Center. The vision of the Developed Tier is a network of sustainable, transit-supporting, mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented, medium-to high-density neighborhoods. In fact, one of the goals of the Developed Tier is to encourage more intense, high-quality housing and economic development in Centers and Corridors. Policy 1 for Centers and Corridors as set forth in the General Plan encourages mixed residential and nonresidential uses at moderate to high densities and intensities in context with surrounding neighborhoods, with a strong emphasis on transit-oriented design. As noted above, the proposed development responds favorably to the General Plan.

“In addition, quality residential development is desirable. (See page 30 of the Sector Plan). In keeping with that recommendation, the applicant’s proposal will offer high end residential development, which would include approximately 8,000 square foot of amenities to support the residents of the building. Specifically, the amenities will include a media center, fitness room, rooftop swimming pool with outdoor areas, and lounge/billiard room.”

**Staff comment:** The proposed infill project is the fourth residential use proposed as a detailed site plan, the first being the Brighton Place development, DSP-04082; the second and third being Addison Road South projects, DSP-05022 and DSP-05072. This property is removed from the properties previously submitted, as this property is in the heart or central part of the town commons and the previously approved projects are in the southern section of the town center. These plans, if approved, may be the most critical step in the revitalizat-

ion of the Addison Road Metro Town Center. The modern, upscale residential condominium building will provide a visual landmark along the MD 214 corridor. The location is highly desirable due to the proximity to the Metro station.

**“2. Promote transit-oriented development near the Metro station. Transit-oriented development serves Metro users, not the automobile.**

“Comment: As designed, the proposed building will provide transit-oriented development near the Metro station, since approximately 23,000 square feet of the first floor of the building will be devoted to commercial/retail space. The proposed commercial/retail area will include restaurants; coffee shop; cleaners, bank and office space, which are similar to the uses identified in the General Plan as being complementary land uses within a transit-oriented and pedestrian-oriented design development. (See page 44-45 of the General Plan). Given that the applicant is proposing a mixed-use building, the commercial/retail uses will provide a service, which will be convenient to Metro station users, pedestrians, residents, workers and visitors to the building.

“Lastly, as designed, only limited parking is available above ground to promote pedestrian traffic, which is consistent with pedestrian-oriented design development.

**“3. Promote pedestrian-oriented development. Pedestrians-oriented development aids Metro users and will encourage pedestrians to use residential and commercial properties near the Metro station; and**

“Comment: The site’s layout makes it convenient for pedestrians to access the various users on the ground level. Although surface parking is available on site to support the ground level commercial/retail uses, the majority of the parking is removed from the pedestrian zone and is provided underground.

**Staff Comment:** The subject application will promote Central Avenue as a main pedestrian route to the Metro station, which will enhance the public streetscape for use by the pedestrian. The sidewalk layout avoids conflict between the pedestrian and the automobile by placing the fronts of buildings along the sidewalk routes and placing the main access to the site at the rear of the building. Although the automobile will be provided for on the site, pedestrian and vehicular conflicts have been minimized. In order to further promote the pedestrian movement along the frontage of the site and into the site, the staff recommends crosswalks where appropriate and pedestrian connections from the sidewalk in the rights-of-way to the in-site sidewalks.

**“4. Compact development in the form of a town center, with a town commons area at Addison Road and MD 214, next to the Metro station. Compact development, with higher development densities favoring Metro users and pedestrians, offers the benefits of the Metro Station to the greatest number of**

**residents and businesses.**

“Comment: As noted above, the Property is located within the town commons, subarea 3–Metro West portion of the Addison Road Metro (ARM) Center. The Sector Plan proposes the town commons for the most compact mix of uses: moderate to high-density residential development, nearby commercial businesses serving residents and Metro users, and a continuous network of narrowed streets oriented to pedestrians. It also encourages a vertical mix of uses. (See pages 90, 166-168 of the Sector Plan). Along the main street of the Town Commons, Addison Road and MD 214, office and/or residential uses are desired above ground floor retail. The applicant proposal is consistent with this recommendation as it contemplates the construction of an 8 story building with approximately 23,000 square feet of retail/commercial uses on the ground level, with 7 stories of luxury condominiums offering 1, 2 and 3 bedroom units. Moreover, the General Plan identifies the Property as part of the Developed Tier and the Addison Road Metro Station as a Community Center. The vision of the Developed Tier is a network of sustainable, transit-supporting, mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented, medium-to high-density neighborhoods. In fact, one of the goals of the Developed Tier is to encourage more intense, high-quality housing and economic development in Centers and Corridors. Policy 1 for Centers and Corridors as set forth in the General Plan encourages mixed residential and nonresidential uses at moderate to high densities and intensities in context with surrounding neighborhoods, with a strong emphasis on transit-oriented design. As noted above, the proposed development responds favorably to the General Plan.

“In addition, quality residential development is desirable. (See page 30 of the Sector Plan). In keeping with that recommendation, the applicant’s proposal will offer high end residential development, which would include approximately 8,000 square foot of amenities to support the residents of the building. Specifically, the amenities will include a media center, fitness room, rooftop swimming pool with outdoor areas, and lounge/billiard room.”

**Staff Comment:** The proposed site plan contributes to the compact form of development envisioned by the DDOZ. The density is proposed as 88 units per net acre. The floor area ratio for the development is proposed as 3.25, which is in keeping with the vision of the general plan. The proposed layout is dense and urban, fulfilling the vision of this sector plan to create an urban environment around the Metro. This is an important contributing factor toward building the appearance of a town center. The detailed site plan layout as a whole conforms to the vision set out by the ARM Town Center Development District.

“Section 27-548.25(d), Site Plan Approval, states the following regarding uses:

**“Special exception procedures shall not apply to uses within a Development District. Uses which would normally require a special exception in the underlying zone shall be permitted uses, if the Development District Standards so provided, subject to site plan**

**review by the Planning Board. Development District Standards may restrict or prohibit any such uses. The Planning Board shall find in its approval of the site plan that the use complies with all applicable Development District Standards, meets the general special exception standards in Section 27-317(a)(1),(4),(5) and (6), and conforms to the recommendations in the Master Plan, Master Plan Amendment, or Sector Plan.** (underling added for emphasis)

“The applicant is proposing two amendments to the table of uses. The first amendment would allow dwelling units (above the first floor) instead of above the third floor in a building containing commercial uses, which are 4 or more stories in height. The second amendment would allow an outdoor rooftop swimming pool. Currently under the Zoning Ordinance, dwelling units (above the third floor) and an outdoor swimming pool would normally require a special exception in the underlying zone. To that end, the applicant believes that its proposal meets the general special exception standards as follows:

“Sec. 27-317 (a) of the Zoning Ordinance provides that a special exception may be approved if:

“(1) The proposed use and site plan are in harmony with the purpose of this Subtitle;

“Comment: The approval of dwelling units (above the first floor) and an outdoor roof-top swimming pool will be in harmony with the purposes of the Zoning Ordinance. The purposes generally seek to protect and promote the health, safety, morals, comfort, convenience and welfare of the present and future inhabitants of the county. The Property, being in the DDOZ, should be development to pedestrian traffic instead of automobile traffic. As designed, the applicant’s site plan is in harmony with the purposes of the DDOZ as noted above.

“(4) The proposed use will not adversely affect the health, safety, or welfare of residents or workers in the area;

“(5) The proposed use will not be detrimental to the use or development of adjacent properties or the general neighborhood;

“Comment: Special exception uses are those uses which are deemed compatible in the specific zone where they are allowed, but are not permitted by right because they may have some potential impact on the health, safety and welfare of the area in which they are proposed. In the subject case, if dwelling units (above the first floor) and an outdoor roof-top swimming pool is allowed, the impacts to adjacent properties and the health, safety and welfare of those residents and workers in the area will not be impacted. On the contrary, the proposed building will provide transit-oriented development near the Metro station, since approximately 23, 000 square feet of the first floor of the building will be devoted to commercial/retail space. The proposed commercial/retail area will include restaurants; coffee shop; cleaners, bank and office space, which are similar to the uses identified in the



General Plan as being complementary land uses within a transit-oriented and pedestrian-oriented design development. (See page 44-45 of the General Plan). Given that the applicant is proposing a mixed-use building, the commercial/retail uses will provide a service, which will be convenient to Metro station users, pedestrians, residents, workers and visitors in the building. Moreover, since only limited parking is available above ground to promote pedestrian traffic and to reduce conflicts with pedestrian routes, the applicant's proposal will not adversely affect the health, safety, or welfare of residents or workers in the area.

“(6) The proposed site plan is in conformance with an approved Tree Conservation Plan.

“Comment: The site is exempt from the Woodland Conservation Ordinance.

“For the foregoing reasons and based upon consideration of the entire proposal, the applicant respectfully requests that the Table of Uses be amended to permit dwelling units (above the first floor) and an outdoor roof-top pool in the Development District/Overlay zone for the Addison Road Sector Plan area.”

**Staff comment:** Staff agrees with the applicant's reasons above for the granting of the change to the use list as requested for both the location of the residential dwellings within the building and the location of the swimming pool on the roof of the building.

8. The detailed site plan is in conformance with the development district standards of the development district overlay plan. Where a development district standard cannot be complied with, Section 27-548.25(c), allows the applicant to ask the Planning Board to apply different development standards unless the plan provides otherwise. The Board must find that the alternate standard will benefit the development and the development district and will not substantially impair implementation of the master plan, master plan amendment, or sector plan. The applicant provides the following discussion in a justification statement submitted on September 6, 2006:

“As part of this application, the following modifications of the Development District Standards are being requested for the applicant's mixed use development to be located on the southwest quadrant of MD 214 and Addison Road.

**“S1. Vehicular Circulation/Access**

**“D. The width of entrance drives shall be visually minimized, where appropriate, by the provision of a planted median of at least six feet in width separating incoming and outgoing traffic, especially if two or more lanes are provided in each direction.**

"The applicant requests the approval of the following revised Development District Standard in lieu of the standard set forth above:

**"The width of entrance drives shall be function of the requirements of the authorizing**

**agencies for the permitting of access into the site.**

“This standard requires the provision of a planted median of at least six (6) feet to reduce the visual impact of entrance drives and to separate incoming and outgoing traffic for multiple lanes in either direction. To address this standard, the applicant is proposing a concrete divided island three (3) feet wide at the entrance with a gradual reduction to one (1) foot at the end. Given the restrict width of the concrete median, no landscaping is being provided within the median, however, the proposed island extends some eleven (11) feet in length, which provides for an orderly separation of incoming and outgoing traffic. Moreover, the applicant is not proposing two or more lanes in each direction, but one (1) inbound and outbound lane. Therefore, the applicant contends that the visual impact of the width of the entrance drive is being minimized by its proposed design. Additionally, the applicant believes that the width of the entrance drives will be further visually minimized, given the width of the sidewalks along Addison Road (8 foot) and Zelma Avenue (5 feet) and the Street tree planting and landscaping requirements for the project. Lastly, this alternate design will not substantially impair implementation of the Master Plan, Master Plan Amendment or Sector Plan, since the proposed development seeks to maximize the public benefits from the Addison Road Metro Station by providing much needed development adjacent to it.”

**Staff comment:** Department of Public Works and Transportation has commented on the entrance of the development from Addison Road. In a letter dated August 9, 2006 (Dawitt Abraham to Lareuse), DPW&T states, “‘pork chop’ island in the southeast entrance would need to be removed. Traffic separation can be handled by double yellow line stripping.” This requirement should supercede the design requirement of the sector plan because the DPW&T requirement is based on traffic geometrics and considers the site design and trip turning movements that the creators of the sector plan could not have known. Therefore, staff recommends approval of the applicant proposal to modify the entrance requirements stated in S.1D above.

**“S.3 Building Siting and setbacks**

**“C. A front build-to line between 10 and 15 feet from the right-of-way shall be established for office, retail/commercial**

"The applicant requests the approval of the following revised Development District Standard in lieu of the standard set forth above:

**"A front build-to line between 5 and 10 feet from the right-of-way shall be encouraged for mixed-use development projects.**

“As noted above, the applicant is developing a mixed-use building, which will include dwelling units from the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor to the 8<sup>th</sup> floor. Commercial/retail/office uses will be located on the first floor. As designed, portions of the building/balconies encroach into the front build-to line required by ARM plan. However, the building does maintain a consistent

front building line and the public zone of the street is properly defined, which will enliven the commercial/retail areas being provided on the first (1<sup>st</sup> floor) of the building. As noted in the Zoning Ordinance, specific purposes of the Development District Overlay Zone include, but are not limited to, (1) promoting an appropriate mix of land uses; (2) encouraging compact development, (3) encouraging pedestrian activity and (4) promoting economic vitality and investment. With the alternate design being proposed by the applicant, the purposes of the DDOZ are being met, which is to encourage flexibility in design development to ensure the implementation of the ARM plan recommendations.”

**Staff comment:** The building has two wings on either end that set forward of the rest of the building along MD 214. Each of the front façades of those portions of the building sets less than 10 feet from the right-of-way line and is located within the public utility easement. The western-most façade is 9.38 feet from the right-of-way line, and the eastern-most façade is 6.91 feet from the right-of-way line. Additionally, the plan identifies that the eastern edge of the building is within the “approximate right-of-way line for Metro tunnel.” These encroachments are in direct violation of the approved preliminary plan of subdivision. Therefore, staff recommends that the eastern wing of the building be adjusted so it does not encroach into the public utility easement on the Metro tunnel right-of-way, and that it be set back a minimum of ten feet.

#### **“S.4 Buffers and Screening**

**“A. All mechanical equipment, dumpsters, storage, service, loading and delivery areas shall be screened from public view and rights-of-way with an appropriate buffer consisting of plantings. Walls or fences in compliance with the Screening Requirements of the Landscape Manual.**

"The applicant requests the approval of the following revised Development District Standard in lieu of the standard set forth above:

**"Except where loading docks partially extend into the building area, all mechanical equipment, dumpsters, storage, service, loading and delivery areas shall be screened from public view and rights-of-way with an appropriate buffer consisting of plantings, walls or fences in compliance with the Screening Requirements of the Landscape Manual.**

“Although the applicant can provide the required screening for all mechanical equipment and the dumpster located along the southern portion of the property, closest to Zelma Avenue, screening for the loading dock nearest to Central Avenue is only partially screened by the 36” masonry wall, other landscaping being provided along Central Avenue and the building itself. Providing screens on either side of the loading docks will not be functional and it may restrict the maneuverability of the trucks. Although the applicant considered locating the loading docks within the garage, it was determined that it will eliminate most needed parking spaces to serve the residential/commercial/retail/office users of the building. It would also require additional space from the first floor, which will further reduce the square footage of space dedicated to commercial/retail/office development. To that end, the applicant believes

that given the building's orientation to Addison Road and Zelma Avenue, the location of the loading docks are far enough from these roadways to accomplish the required screening from public view."

**Staff comment:** Staff agrees with the applicant's request to modify the development district standard because the loading facility is partially inset into the building and because of the difficulty in screening the exposed portion of the loading space. A loading dock has been provided which is interior to the building which provides protection from the elements. Since the project is proposed as condominium ownership, as opposed to rental apartments, the frequency of the use of the loading area will be substantially less often.

**"S.5 Free Standing Signs**

- "B. The maximum height of freestanding signs shall be 8 feet in the town commons and 13 feet elsewhere in the town center as measured from the finished grade at the base of the sign to the top of the sign for all commercial zones, as modified from Section 27-614(b)**
- "C. The area of the freestanding sign shall not exceed 1 square foot for each 2 linear feet of street frontage, to a maximum of 100 square feet for each sign for building(s) located in an integrated shopping center, other commercial center with 3 or more businesses served by common and immediate off-street parking and loading facilities, or an office building complex, as modified from Section 27-614(c). The street frontage shall be measured on the property occupied by the center or complex associated with the sign.**
- "E. The quantity of freestanding signs shall be equal to or less than the amount required by Section 27-614(d) Freestanding Signs, in Part 12 of the Zoning Ordinance.**
- "H. Signs that are externally lit are recommended and should be directed to illuminate the sign face only.**

"The applicant requests the approval of the following revised Development District Standard as identified in the underlined text below:

- "B. The maximum height of freestanding signs shall be 8 feet in the town commons and 13 feet elsewhere in the town center as measured from the finished grade at the base of the sign to the top of the sign for all commercial zones, as modified from Section 27-614(b), unless part of a mixed-use development, in which case the maximum height shall not exceed 23 feet.**
- "C. The area of the freestanding sign shall not exceed 1 square foot for each 2 linear feet of street frontage, to a maximum of 100 square feet for each sign for building(s) located**

**in an integrated shopping center, other commercial center with 3 or more businesses served by common and immediate off-street parking and loading facilities, or an office building complex, as modified from Section 27-614(c), unless such uses are located directly adjacent to a Metro Station, in which case the area of the freestanding sign shall not exceed a minimum of 225 square feet for each sign. The street frontage shall be measured on the property occupied by the center or complex associated with the sign.**

**"E. Except as part of a mixed-use development with a residential component, the quantity of freestanding signs shall be equal to or less than the amount required by Section 27-614(d) Freestanding Signs, in Part 12 of the Zoning Ordinance, in which case, one (1) sign shall be permitted to identify the residential component. Exact sign locations shall be determined at site plan approval.**

**"H. Signs that are externally lit are recommended and should be directed to illuminate the sign face only.**

“With respect to the standards outlined above, the applicant is proposing three (3) free standing signs for the property. Each of the signs is attractively designed and will be constructed of quality materials complementary to the building design. Although the applicant is allowed three (3) signs on the property, they are to be located one on each street with frontage (i.e., Zelma Avenue, Central Avenue and Addison Road) in accordance with Section 27-614(d). Given the sites proximity to residential uses along Zelma Avenue, however, the applicant has opted not to locate a sign on Zelma Avenue, but to relocate it along Central Avenue, which is a more appropriate location, given the commercial uses across the street.

“Further, each of the signs being proposed is slightly larger in height and area than is allowed in the ARM Plan. Specifically, the applicant is proposing two (2) 22’-8” signs along Central Avenue and Addison Road and a 12’-8” sign at the corner of Central and Addison Road. Currently, the ARM Plan recommends 8-foot signs within the town commons and 13 feet elsewhere in the town center. With respect to sign area, the ARM Plan requires that the area of each freestanding sign be limited to not more than 100 square feet. Since the two (2) signs located on Central Avenue and Addison Road are 220 square feet, and 120 square feet at the corner of Central Avenue and Addison Road, the applicant is requesting an amendment of this requirement. In support of its position, the applicant maintains that the slightly larger signs are necessary given the mixed-use nature of the proposed building. Further, the signs are ground/monument signs and attractively designed, which are consistent with the recommendation of the ARM Plan. Since the chief single purpose of the ARM Plan is to maximize the public benefits from the Addison Road Metro Station, a revitalize town center with new, upscale residential and commercial development must be encouraged and promoted. If the businesses proposed for the first (1<sup>st</sup> floor) of the building are not given adequate signage to enable them to succeed, then the goal of encouraging mixed-use development will not be realized in this area.”

**Staff comment:** The following is a discussion and analysis each of the requirements above:

**S.5B** The project is within the town common portion of the town center plan. The proposal to increase the allowable height of signage for the development from 8 feet to 22 feet and 8 inches is extraordinary and is 280 percent larger than that allowed by the sector plan. The intent of the sector plan is to limit the size of freestanding signage so that the streetscape is pedestrian friendly and scaled to not dwarf pedestrians. At the same time, the applicant wants the retail uses on the first floor of the building to have adequate signage to assure success in alerting vehicular passersby that the businesses exist. In looking at all of the proposed signage for the site, including the freestanding signage, and the building-mounted signage, staff recommends that the freestanding signage be reduced in size to be no higher than 13 feet, in keeping with the requirements of the overall town center.

**S.5C** This standard limits the amount of area of the signs. In this case, the applicant is proposing two identical freestanding signs 19.66 feet tall (not including a 3-foot-high masonry sign base) by 10 feet wide, an area of 196.6 square feet. The third sign is 9.66 feet tall (not including a 3-foot-high masonry sign base) by 10 feet wide. The area of the shorter sign is 96.6 square feet. The sector plan language allows the following area of signage for each sign, which has been identified by its location:

Along MD 214 (frontage 346.38)—Maximum sign area allowed is 100 square feet. Applicant is asking for 96.6 additional square feet of sign area.

At the intersection of MD 214 and Addison Road (frontage 100.00)—Maximum sign area allowed is 50 square feet. Applicant is asking for 46.6 additional square feet of sign area.

Along Addison Road (frontage 153.33)—Maximum sign area allowed is 76.6 square feet. Applicant is asking for 120 additional square feet of sign area.

**S.5E** This standard addresses the quantity of signage allowed for a site, and it refers to Section 27-614(d), which states the following:

100 to 1,100 feet on each of two parallel (or approximately parallel) streets	One on each street
---	--------------------

In this case, the site is allowed two signs, one on each of the parallel streets of the project. The applicant is asking that the location of the sign that would normally be allowed to be placed on Zelma Avenue (parallel to Addison Road) instead be placed on MD 214. Staff agrees with the applicant's proposal to relocate the sign, because a sign located on Zelma, a primarily residential street, is inappropriate and a sign on the arterial frontage of MD 214, a commercial zone, is appropriate. However, the applicant is also asking for a sign at the intersection of MD 214 and Addison Road,

which seems to result in too many signs in a small area. Staff recommends that the sign located at the intersection be removed from the plans to reduce the number of signs for the project from three to two. The sign is partially located within the right-of-way line of the Metro tunnel, the sign is directly adjacent to a bioretention area which could be expanded, and the sign could obstruct the vision of vehicles making a right turn when the future widening of MD 214 occurs. Staff also recommends that the sign along MD 214 be relocated outside the right-of-way for MD 214 and outside of the right-of-way of the Metro tunnel (unless approved by WMATA).

**S.5H** The applicant has not provided a justification for this amendment; however, the requirement is flexible and the staff does not have an objection to the proposed back-lit letters for the freestanding signage which will require a revision to the plans. The plan currently includes a box panel illumination with cutout letters. Staff recommends back-lit letters.

In summation of the requests above, staff recommends that the plan be revised to eliminate the freestanding sign located at the intersection of MD 214 and Addison Road, allow the locations of one sign along MD 214 and one sign along Addison Road, limit the height of each freestanding sign to not more than 13 feet in height (including the 3-foot-high masonry base), and allow the area of the signs to be not more than 100 square feet each.

**“B1. Height, Scale and Massing**

**“H. Service area shall be architecturally integrated into the overall design of buildings.**

"The applicant requests the approval of the following revised Development District Standard as identified in the underlined text below:

**"H. Service area shall be architecturally integrated into the overall design of buildings, where feasible.**

“A noted above, the loading dock nearest to Central Avenue is only partially screened by the 36” masonry wall, other landscaping being provided along Central Avenue and the building itself. Providing screens on either side of the loading docks will not be functional and it may restrict the maneuverability of the trucks. Although the applicant considered locating the loading docks within the garage, it was determined that it will eliminate must-needed parking spaces to serve the residential/commercial/retail/office users of the building. It would also require additional space from the first floor, which will further reduce the square footage of space dedicated to commercial/retail/office development. To that end, the applicant believes that given the building’s orientation to Addison Road and Zelma Avenue, the location of the loading docks are far enough from these roadways to accomplish the required screening from public view.”

**Staff comment:** Staff agrees with the applicant’s proposal for loading on the site. There is little ability due to the size of the site and the configuration of the building to screen the loading with

architectural extensions of the building.

**“I. Proposed buildings shall be between one and four stories in total height within the town center.**

"The applicant requests the approval of the following revised Development District Standard as identified in the underlined text below:

**"I. Proposed buildings shall be between one and four stories in total height within the town center unless located directly adjacent to a Metro station.**

“Although the applicant’s building is 8 stories high, which is taller than provided for in the ARM Plan, it is not inconsistent with the desire to encourage a vertical mix of uses and to the provision of office and/or residential uses above ground floor retail of along the main street of the Town Commons, Addison Road and MD 214. (See pages 90, 166-168 of the Sector Plan). The applicant proposal is consistent with this recommendation. It will revitalize the town center with new, upscale residential and commercial development that will lead to new business and residents in the area. Furthermore, residents, workers and Metro riders will utilize the ground floor retail/commercial uses, which will implement the ARM Plan’s goal of promoting both transit-oriented and pedestrian-oriented development a Metro station. Lastly, since the applicant is building vertically instead of horizontally, it is a compact development, with higher development densities that favor Metro users and pedestrians.”

**Staff comment:** The applicant’s proposal for the eight-story building is supported by staff because of the upscale nature of the proposal and the desire to increase densities near the Metro station is in accordance with the General Plan. Furthermore, the limitation to four stories is inconsistent with the use table, which says that a multifamily building is allowed in a building containing four or more stories, provided the residential units are located above the third story. It would not be feasible to create a multifamily building with only one floor of dwelling units, as would be the result under the requirements above. The impact of the building’s height on adjacent properties will be minimal due to the streets surrounding the property. The building is set back far enough from the southern property line to negate impacts on the properties to the south.

9. The alternative development district standards will benefit the proposed development and the district and will not substantially impair implementation of the DDOZ. The site plan will meet all other mandatory requirements; however the following requirements warrant discussion:

**S1.C Vehicular entrance drives shall permit safe and clear pedestrian crossings. Sidewalk material should continue across driveway aprons.**

Comment: Staff recommends that the plans be revised to provide crosswalks with a change of material across driveway aprons.



**S4.A All mechanical equipment, dumpsters, storage, service, loading and delivery areas shall be screened from public views and rights-of-way with an appropriate buffer consisting of plantings, walls or fences in compliance with the screening requirements of the Landscape Manual.**

Comment: The staff recommends that a condition be attached to the approval of the plan that states the requirements above because as a site develops, additional mechanical equipment and utility boxes can appear on the site. If this should be the case, then the applicant will be placed on notice that efforts should be made to screen these facilities from public view, if possible. Furthermore, the applicant should revise the plans to upgrade the dumpster enclosure to a masonry structure, rather than the board-on-board fencing proposed.

**S4.F Residential uses within the town center shall comply with the residential Planting Requirements of the Landscape Manual.**

Comment: The plans do not demonstrate conformance to Section 4.1, Residential Planting Requirements of the Landscape Manual. Therefore the plans should be revised to provide the calculations and plant material necessary to comply with that section.

**S5A. The location of freestanding signs shall comply with Section 27-614(a) Freestanding Signs in Part 12 of the Zoning Ordinance.**

Comment: Section 27-614(a) is provide below for reference.

**(a) Location.**

**(4) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Subtitle addressing setbacks and yards, in all Commercial and Industrial Zones (except the I-3 Zone), signs need only be located ten (10) feet behind the street line. Where the street line is situated behind the actual existing street right-of-way line, freestanding on-site signs may be temporarily located within the area between the street line and the existing street right-of-way line (the area of proposed future widening of an existing street), provided that:**

- (A) The land area involved has not been, and is not in the process of being, acquired for street purposes;**
- (B) The sign is located at least ten (10) feet behind the existing street right-of-way line; and**
- (C) A written agreement between the owner and the Department of Environmental Resources assures that the sign will be removed, at the owner's expense, at the time of acquisition of**

**that area for street purposes.**

Comment: The location of the three proposed freestanding signs are shown in the right-of-way and within ten feet of the right-of-way. The applicant has not submitted information to allow the sign to be within the right-of-way or within 10 feet of the right-of-way. Therefore, staff recommends that the signs be relocated in accordance with the requirement of ten feet from the ultimate right-of-way line, such that the signs will be set back a sufficient distance to maintain unobstructed lines of vision for traffic at the entrance to the development.

**S5.F Signs shall primarily serve to identify the name and the type of business establishment only.**

Comment: The requirement above does not recognize that a freestanding sign on a mixed-use project such as this one could also include the permanent real estate identification sign as part of the freestanding sign. This is proposed in the application. Staff does not object to the identification of the condominium in the sign, and recommends that the Planning Board approve an amendment to allow the identification of the residential condominium on the sign.

**P5.B. At the time of the first site plan along MD 214 and/or Addison Road corridors, a consistent type of ornamental pole and luminaires shall be selected in consultation with DPW&T.**

**P5.C At the time of the first site plan in Metro West or Addison South, a consistent type of ornamental pole and luminaires shall be selected in consultation with DPW&T.**

Comment: With approval of DSP-04082 (Brighton Place) and DSP-05022 and DSP-05072 (Addison Road South) poles and luminaires have been selected. This plan should be revised to include the luminaires on site in the front of the building, in the courtyard and along the street line of Addison Road, subject to DPW&T approval.

## **Public Areas P6.Utilites**

### **Objective**

**To reduce the visual impact of existing overhead utility lines along major road corridors in the town center by consolidating utility pole usage or placing existing utility lines underground, where possible.**

### **Design Standards:**

**A All future development within the town center shall place all appropriate utilities underground. New Residential development in Addison Plaza West, Addison South,**

**Metro West and Barber Village shall also place all utilities underground.**

Comment: The objective statement above lends insight to the development standard following it, because it clarifies the goal of the sector plan to underground existing utilities. The applicant has shown the existing overhead utilities on the plan and they are located on all three sides of the property adjacent to the roadways. The applicant has not asked for an amendment to this standard. However, the staff believes that the intent of the development standard is to require new development to underground overhead utilities in the area of the site. Therefore, the staff recommends that the plans be revised to underground the utilities on each of the three sides of the development and notes should be added to the plans accordingly.

**B7.A Signs shall primarily serve to identify the name and the type of business establishment only.**

Comment: The requirement above does not recognize that building-mounted signs could also include the permanent real estate identification sign. This is proposed in the application. The staff does not object to the identification of the condominium in the sign, above the main entrance of the building and located at three points at the top portion of the building.

**B7.C Building signs shall be simply designed, contain a minimum amount of information and have a maximum of three colors. Building signs that are excessively elaborate, oversized in proportions or use poor quality materials are not permitted.**

Comment: The plans include a common sign plan that provides a clear understanding of the proposed signage for the site. However, staff recommends that a condition be added to the plans to limit the color of building-mounted signage to no more than three colors, in accordance with the requirements above.

10. The application has been reviewed for conformance to the C-S-C zone as required by Section 27-548.21, which states the following:

**The Development District Overlay Zone shall be placed over other zones on the Zoning Map, and may modify specific requirements of those underlying zones. Only those requirements of the underlying zones specifically noted in this Subdivision and elsewhere in this Subtitle are modified. All other requirements of the underlying zones are unaffected by the Development District Overlay Zone.**

The plan was reviewed for conformance to the requirements of the C-S-C zone regulations and was found to be in conformance with them

11. **Conformance to Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-05068:** The plan layout is consistent with the layout approved at the time of the preliminary plan of subdivision, with a few minor changes. The following conditions relate to the review of the detailed site plan (DSP):

- 2. In conjunction with the detailed site plan, a Type II tree conservation plan shall be approved, if required.**

Comment: A Type II tree conservation plan is not required. A letter of exemption has been issued for this site.

- 5. A Phase II noise study shall be prepared and included in the submission package for the detailed site plan (DSP). It shall contain specific building material recommendations to ensure that the interior noise levels are 45 dBA Ldn or less. The DSP shall locate any outdoor activity areas and the noise study shall address how noise levels have been mitigated to 65 dBA Ldn or less for these areas. The DSP shall address, if it is determined appropriate, the issue of possible ground vibration from the Metro tunnel located in the northeast corner of the site.**

**Comment:** A Phase II noise study was not submitted with the subject application as required.

A "Phase I: Traffic Noise and Metro Rail Vibration Analysis, The Addison Icon," prepared by Phoenix Noise & Vibration LLC, and dated May 5, 2006, was submitted at the time of preliminary plan review. Results from the study reflected noise impacts in excess of 72 dBA to the northeast corner of the building and showed delineated 70 and 65 dBA unmitigated noise contour related to Central Avenue and Addison Road on the site at ground level, mid-level, and top level. The location of these noise contours was accepted at the time of the preliminary plan based on supporting data including in the Phase I noise study, although the distances were less than those calculated by the EPS noise model.

Residential structures of standard construction will reduce noise levels as high as 65 dBA to an interior noise level of 45 dBA without modification. For this project, noise impacts identified in the Phase I noise study varied from 65 to 72 dBA. It was, therefore, required that a Phase II noise study be submitted to address building shell mitigation measures. Necessary mitigation measures cannot be determined without a Phase II noise study.

The only outdoor activity area identified for noise evaluation in the Phase I noise study is a pool area situated upon the roof, but the location has not been shown on the plans, or on the Phase I noise study figures. The Phase I noise study states that noise levels on the roof were evaluated in the vicinity of the proposed pool and it was determined that traffic noise levels would be below 65 dBA LDN, thereby meeting county standards for outdoor activity areas. The figure showing the top-level noise contours indicates that the unmitigated 65 dBA Ldn noise contour impacts the majority of the roof surface. Since the location of the pool has not been shown on the plans, and a full evaluation of noise impacts on the pool area has not been provided, this cannot be verified. The Phase II noise study should provide additional analysis supporting the conclusion that mitigation for the pool is not necessary to achieve noise levels of less than 65 dBA Ldn.

The Phase I noise study also addressed vibration on the site caused by Metro Rail. Measurements were taken. For vibration, the measured levels of the current conditions complied with ISO standards

established for such impacts on residential or commercial uses. The Environmental Planning Section agreed that the mitigation of Metro Rail vibration was not required for this site at time of preliminary plan.

**Recommended Condition:** Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, a Phase II noise study shall be submitted for the subject property. The Phase II noise study shall include a building shell analysis and shall address the building shell noise mitigation measures necessary to achieve residential indoor noise levels of 45 dBA Ldn. The Phase II noise study shall also address the mitigation of noise impacts for outdoor activity areas to acceptable noise levels, if indicated.

**Recommended Condition:** Prior to the certification of the detailed site plan, the architecture for the building shall be certified by a professional engineer with competency in acoustical analysis demonstrating that the design and construction of building shells within the noise corridor of Central Avenue and Addison Road will reduce interior noise levels to 45 dBA Ldn or less.

**Recommended Condition:** Prior to the certification of the detailed site plan, the plan shall be revised to show the location of all outdoor activity areas. If noise mitigation is indicated by the Phase II noise study, the plans shall be revised to show all noise mitigation measures required to achieve acceptable noise levels of 65 dBA Ldn or less.

6. **At time of DSP review, the DSP shall show the locations and design of all bioretention and/or infiltration facilities for stormwater management and all associated landscaping shall be shown on the landscape plan.**

**Comment:** Stormwater Management Concept Approval (24628-2005) indicates that water quality will be provided with either bioretention or infiltration for the parking lot. The plans show the location of a bioretention pond in the northeast corner of the site. The Department of Environmental Resources will review specific landscaping for the bioretention area at time of technical approval.

9. **The applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assignees shall make a monetary contribution (determined at the time of detailed site plan) to the M-NCPPC Department of Parks and Recreation for the development of the Rollins Avenue Neighborhood Park, for the fulfillment of the mandatory dedication of parkland requirements. The timing for the payment of the monetary contribution shall be established at the time of review of the DSP.**

As of the writing of this report, the Department of Parks and Recreation is in the process of preparing a referral in this case addressing the issue above. Staff will be prepared to present information relating to the issue above at the Planning Board Meeting.

17. **The following access and circulation issues shall be addressed at the time of detailed site plan:**
  - a. **The elimination of the direct access to the parking garage from Zelma Avenue.**

- b. The provision of limited access to Addison Road, which prohibits any left turn to and from the site.**
- 18. Total development within the subject property under this preliminary plan shall be limited to 162 residences (21 three bedroom units, 113 two bedroom units, and 28 one bedroom units), and 24,500 gross square feet of retail commercial uses, or other mix of commercial and residential uses that generate no more than 163 AM and 226 PM peak hour vehicle trips. Any development beyond the AM and PM peak hour trips noted herein shall require a new preliminary plan of subdivision with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities.”**

**Comment:** See the Transportation Planning Section discussion of the two items above in Finding No. 12 below.

#### **Referrals:**

- 12. The Transportation Planning Section has reviewed the detailed site plan and provided the comments below.

The Transportation Planning Section has reviewed the detailed site plan revision application referenced above. The subject property consists of approximately 1.94 acres of land in the C-S-C Zone. The property is located on the south side of Central Avenue (MD 214) between Addison Road and Zelma Avenue. The applicant proposes to develop the property under C-S-C zoning with up to 23,000 gross square feet of commercial space and a total of 170 residential apartment units.

The site plan is acceptable from the standpoint of access and circulation, provided the proposed access to Addison Road is constructed such that it physically prohibits any left turn to and from the site. The applicant's desire to allow for left turns into the site from Addison Road must be approved by the county's DPW&T prior to its incorporation in the submitted detailed site plan. Appropriate dedication along MD 214, Addison Road, and Zelma Avenue as determined under Preliminary Plan 4-01012, is reflected on the plan. The plan shows wide sidewalks along all three roadways, but safe pedestrian crosswalks across Central Avenue and Addison Road are not shown.

As part of this detailed site plan, the applicant has also prepared a statement of justification seeking departure from the required number of parking spaces, as required by the Zoning Ordinance, by as much as 132 spaces. This equates to a 29 percent reduction of the required number of parking spaces, which is significantly less than the 50 percent reduction allowed by the Addison Road Metro (ARM) Plan. Considering the site is located directly opposite of the Addison Road Metro, staff supports the applicant's desire to reduce the number of on-site parking, as it would promote less traffic congestion and more transit use.

At the time of Preliminary Plan 4-01012, a number of transportation-related conditions were placed on the property pursuant to a finding of adequate transportation facilities. The status of these

conditions is as follow:

Conditions 10, 11, 14, 15, and 17 provide a list of off-site transportation improvements, which all are enforceable at the time of building permit.

Condition 18 indicates a trip cap for the subject site. Based on the number of specific uses that are proposed and shown on the detailed site plan, the following table summarizes trip generation for the proposed uses:

<b>Trip Generation of Subject Plan</b>			
Use	Quantity	AM Trips	PM Trips
Retail (assuming 60 percent pass-by)	23,000 square feet	20	89
Residential apartments (high-rise)	170 units	51	68
<b>Total - As proposed on DSP</b>		<b>71</b>	<b>157</b>
<b>Total - Trip Cap for 4-05068</b>		<b>163</b>	<b>226</b>

As noted above, the subject plan would conform to the trip cap imposed at the time of preliminary plan.

In conclusion, the transportation planning staff has no objection to the plan, provided that the plan is revised to show that the site's access to Addison Road is constructed such that it physically prohibits any left turn to and from the site.

Comment: The plan proposes two lanes into the property and a right-turning movement only from the site onto Addison Road southbound. Therefore, the plan does not propose a left-turning movement onto Addison Road northbound at this time. However, this issue should be affirmatively addressed by the Department of Public Works and Transportation at the time of the access permit review, because the referral memo dated August 9, 2006, from that office did not specifically address this issue.

13. The Community Planning Division found that this application is consistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies for the Developed Tier. The subject property is located at a designated community center in the Developed Tier. The vision for centers is mixed residential and nonresidential uses at moderate to high densities and intensities, with a strong emphasis on transit-oriented development. The vision for the Developed Tier is a network of sustainable, transit-supporting, mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented, medium- to high-density neighborhoods. Community centers are concentrations of activities, services, and land uses that serve the immediate community. These typically include a variety of public facilities and services—integrated commercial, office, and some residential development—and can include mixed-use and higher intensity redevelopment in some communities.

The application conforms to the land use recommendations for transit-oriented uses and Development District Overlay Zone (DDOZ) development standards of the 2000 *Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Addison Road Metro Town Center and Vicinity*. This sectional map amendment rezoned the subject property from C-O Zone to the C-S-C Zone and placed the DDOZ over the C-S-C Zone to permit mixed-use densities for the subject property.

**Applicant's Proposal:** The applicant requests approval for amending the DDOZ Use Table to allow dwelling units within a building containing commercial uses, which is four or more stories, provided the units are located above the first story, and also to allow an outdoor rooftop swimming pool.

**Staff Comments:** The sector plan recommends mixed-use, office, and retail development for the property (p.51). It envisions a pedestrian-oriented town center style of development to create a sense of place for the community (p.47). It encourages a vertical mix of uses (p.90, 5<sup>th</sup> bullet). Adding a residential component to the subject property on the above-ground floors and a rooftop swimming pool do not impair of the integrity of the plan.

While the applicant's proposals on access, parking area, building siting and setbacks, buffers and screening, freestanding signs, building-mounted signs, sidewalks, trails and crosswalks, and trees and plantings are not exactly per the DDOZ standards, they meet the intent of the sector plan.

14. The Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) reviewed the original site plan and provided comments in a memorandum dated August 9, 2006. The DPW&T provided revised comments in a September 20, 2006 memorandum as follows:

“a. The property is located on the south side of Central Avenue (MD 214), between Addison Road and Zelma Avenue. Right-of-way dedication and frontage improvements in accordance with DPW&T's urban arterial road standards are required for Addison Road; urban primary residential road standards will be required for Zelma Avenue. The Detailed Site Plan correctly shows the widening of Zelma Avenue in compliance with primary road standards with a transition back to the existing narrower pavement width at the proposed commercial entrance at the southern property line. Urban arterial pavement width along the entire Addison Road South frontage has not been provided. A transition from the required urban arterial width at the southwest curb return of Addison Road South and MD 214 to the existing narrower pavement width immediately north of the proposed entrance located at the southern property line is provided. This appears to have been done to ensure sufficient transition length for vehicles turning south onto Addison Road South from eastbound MD 214. We recommend construction of the full urban arterial width to the proposed entrance on Addison Road South. This will provide an exclusive lane for those entering the site from eastbound MD 214. The transition to southbound Addison Road South for those not entering the site can be provided with pavement marking. The complete urban arterial section will be provided with the future Addison Road Capital Improvement Program project. The developer will, therefore, make a fee-in-lieu payment for the cost of providing



the remainder of the widening to full urban arterial road standards along the entire Addison Road South frontage.

- “b. MD 214 is under the jurisdiction of the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA). Permit procedures and frontage improvements for MD 214 will be determined by the SHA.
  - “c. The 24’ wide commercial entrance at Zelma Avenue is acceptable.
  - “d. Full-width, 2” mill and overlay for Zelma Avenue is required. Overlay of the Addison Road South frontage will not be needed.
  - “e. Conformance with DPW&T street tree and street lighting standards is required.
  - “f. All storm drainage systems and facilities are to be in accordance with DPW&T's and the Department of Environmental Resources' requirements.
  - “g. A soils investigation report which includes subsurface exploration and geotechnical engineering evaluation for public streets is required.
  - “h. A storm drain catch basin is proposed at the dumpster located at the southwest corner of the site. The catch basin should be separated from the dumpster.
  - “i. The sign shown on the Detailed Site Plan near the southeast site entrance is within the Addison Road South right-of-way. The property owner will need to sign a maintenance agreement for this sign requiring the relocation of the sign from the right of way at the request of DPW&T.
  - “j. The design of the southeast entrance from Addison Road South needs to be revised to prohibit left turn movements, both from and into this site.
  - “k. The retaining wall along the southern property line extends onto the public right-of-way of both Zelma Avenue and Addison Road South. Retaining walls are precluded from the public right of way.
  - “l. We recommend that the developer obtain an agreement with the neighborhood representatives due to the anticipated increase in traffic on Zelma Avenue.”
15. In a memorandum dated August 21, 2006 (Metzger to Lareuse), the Environmental Planning Section offered the following comments:

The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of DSP-06001 subject to conditions listed in the recommendation section of this report.

The Environmental Planning Section previously reviewed the subject property as Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-05068, which was approved with conditions. This site has a stormwater management

concept approval letter (CSD 24628-2005-00) dated July 18,2005.

This 1.94-acre site is located on the south side of Central Avenue, in the southwest quadrant of the intersection of Central Avenue and Addison Road. A review of the available information indicates that streams, wetlands, severe slopes, and areas of steep slopes with highly erodible soils are not found to occur on this property. There is no 100-year floodplain that is associated with the site. Central Avenue is an arterial roadway, which are generally regulated for noise impacts. The predominant soil type found to occur on this site, according to the Prince George's County Soil Survey, is Collington. This soil series has limitations with respect to steep slopes but will not affect the site layout. According to available information, Marlboro clay does not occur on this property. According to information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Wildlife and Heritage Program, there are no rare, threatened, or endangered species found to occur in the vicinity of this property. There are no designated scenic or historic roads in the vicinity of this application. This property is located in the Lower Anacostia River watershed of the Anacostia River basin and is in the Developed Tier as reflected in the adopted General Plan. The approved Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan shows this site as an evaluation area

The subject property is located within Subarea 3 of the sector plan. The environmental requirements for woodland preservation, stormwater management and noise are addressed in the Environmental Review Section below. There are no specific environmental requirements or design standards that require review for conformance.

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

The Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, 4-05068, is subject to the additional environmental conditions of approval as stated in PGCPB Resolution No. 06-37. The condition below is applicable to detailed site plan review.

### **3. Development of this site shall be in conformance with the Stormwater Management Concept Plan, # 24628-2005-00, and any subsequent revisions.**

**Comment:** Conformance with the stormwater management concept approval will be met through subsequent reviews by the Department of Environmental Resources.

### **ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

- a. The subject property has a signed natural resources inventory (NRI/049/05), dated July 18, 2005, that was approved prior to the preliminary plan of subdivision. The detailed site plan shows all of the required information in conformance with the NRI. No revisions are required for conformance to the NRI.
- b. This property is not subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because the site contains less than 10,000 square feet of woodlands and there is no previously approved tree conservation plan on the subject property. The

Environmental Planning Section, Countywide Planning Division, issued a standard letter of exemption from the ordinance, on September 8, 2005. No further action is needed at this time as it relates to woodland requirements. The letter of exemption should accompany all future application for plans and permits.

- c. The subject property abuts Central Avenue and Addison Road, both arterials and generally regulated for noise. Based on the Environmental Planning Section's noise model, an analysis of the noise generated by the two highways indicates that the 65 dBA Ldn noise contours would be located approximately 228 feet and 192 feet from the centerlines of the respective roadways. The plan has shown the noise contours to be 220 feet and 190 feet from the respective roadways, based on a Phase I noise study at the time the preliminary plan was accepted and approved. Results from the study reflected noise impact on-site in excess of 65 dBA Ldn and recommended the need for interior noise mitigation measures. The submittal of the required Phase II noise study and required revisions to the detailed site plan prior to certification were previously addressed in response to conditions of preliminary plan approval.
  - d. A stormwater management concept approval letter (24628-2005-00) dated July 18, 2005, was submitted for the subject property. The concept approval letter states that bioretention or infiltration facilities will be provided. The detailed site plan as submitted shows the location of the bioretention pond. The design and landscaping of the bioretention pond will be addressed by the Department of Environmental Resources in subsequent technical reviews.
16. The following comments were generated by the Permit Review Office and have to be addressed:
- a. 8 handicap accessible parking spaces are required based upon the total of 328 parking spaces provided.  
  
Comment: The plan should be changed to reflect 8 rather than 7 handicap parking spaces.
  - b. Loading must setback a minimum of 50 feet from residentially zoned property.  
  
Comment: Loading is shown more than fifty feet from a residentially zoned property; additionally, a note on the plan indicates that the site will be posted with signage that states "No Loading and Unloading beyond this point." This verbiage is an attempt to prevent loading near the residentially zoned property to the south. However, additional signage is needed in order to prevent trucks from using Zelma Avenue for access. The staff recommends that a second sign be added at the access point at Zelma Avenue, to state that all truck loading access must use the Addison Road entrance.
  - c. Parking for the recreational facilities will not be required, provided the recreational facilities only serve residents and their guests.  
  
Comment: A note should be added to the plans that recreational facilities will only serve residents

and guests.

- d. The proposed signs must be setback 10 feet from the proposed ultimate right-of-way.

Comment: A condition has been attached to the plans that require the signs to be at least 10 feet from the right-of-way line.

- e. Two signs are allowed pursuant to 27-614(d) for frontage on parallel streets, 1 for each street.

Comment: A condition has been attached to the plans that require the deletion of one sign, for a maximum of two signs for the site.

- f. Please clearly identify the right-of-way line for the WMATA Tunnel. One or more signs and a portion of the building appear to encroach the Tunnel r-o-w. This was also a condition of approval for PGCPB No. 06-37 Condition 1e.

Comment: The following language was included in the approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision for this case:

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

- e. Label a building restriction line for the right-of-way of the Metro tunnel.**

The detailed site plan proposes a portion of the building and a freestanding sign within the right-of-way for the Metro. Staff recommends that the plans be revised to remove both structures from the Metro right-of-way prior to signature approval of the plans.

- 17. The application was sent to the following surrounding municipalities for review: Capitol Heights, Fairmount Heights, and Seat Pleasant. As of the writing of this report, no responses have been received.
- 18. Urban Design Section review has raised a concern relating to the following issue:

The project is an eight-story building that is primarily residential. The view from the upper floors to the ground level should be carefully considered in order to provide an interesting view for the residents of the upper floors. The front courtyard of the building could be enhanced through the use of paving materials that would provide some visual interest and could also provide a plaza-like environment in front of the commercial area. The circular drop-off area could include special paving patterns that would be of interest and provide detail as one enters the building, the sidewalk areas should provide ornamental street tree plantings and shrub and ground cover plantings in lieu of exclusive use of grass. The plans should be revised prior to signature approval to include special paving material in the

parking area at the front of the building, street tree plantings, special sidewalk paving, a sidewalk wide enough to allow pedestrians to move from the front of the building to the east side of the building, handicap spaces dispersed around the site, and the use of flag poles or an art piece in the center island. Awnings should be colorful and provide additional interest. An area of outdoor seating should also be considered in conjunction with a tenant use such as a restaurant coffee shop.

19. 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 without requiring unreasonable costs and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

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 Detailed Site Plan DSP-06001, subject to the following conditions:

- Staff recommends that the Planning Board recommend to the District Council approval of the change to the use list as described in Finding No. 7 above (to allow dwelling units above the first floor in a building containing commercial uses which is four stories or more in height, and to allow an outdoor rooftop swimming pool).
- Staff recommends approval of the alternative development district standards for:
  - S1.D (to allow the width of the entrance drive to be a function of the requirements of the authorizing agency)
  - S4.A (to exempt loading spaces that partially extend into the building from screening requirements of the Landscape Manual)
  - S5.B (to allow the height of the freestanding sign to be increased from 8 to 13 feet in height)
  - B1.H (to allow the loading space to partially integrated into the overall design of the building)
  - B1.I (to allow the increase in the height of the building from four stories to eight stories)
  - S5.F (to allow the permanent real estate identification as part of the freestanding sign)
  - B7.A (to allow the permanent real estate identification as part of the building mounted signage)
- Staff recommends denial of the alternative development district standard for:
  - S3.C (to allow the build-to-line to be reduced from 10–15 feet to 5–10 feet from the right-

of-way)

- S5.C (to allow the area of the freestanding signs to be increased from 100 square feet to 225 square feet)
- S5.E (to allow the quantity of freestanding signs to be increased from 2 to 3)
- Staff recommends that APPROVAL of DSP-06001 be subject to the following conditions:
  1. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, a Phase II noise study shall be submitted for the subject property. The Phase II noise study shall include a building shell analysis and shall address the building shell noise mitigation measures necessary to achieve Prince George's County residential indoor noise levels of 45 dBA Ldn. The Phase II noise study shall also address the mitigation of noise impacts for outdoor activity areas to acceptable noise levels, if indicated.
  2. Prior to the certification of the detailed site plan, the architecture for the building shall be certified by a professional engineer with competency in acoustical analysis demonstrating that the design and construction of building shells within the noise corridor of Central Avenue and Addison Road will reduce interior noise levels to 45 dBA Ldn or less.
  3. Prior to the certification of the detailed site plan, the plan shall be revised to show the location of all outdoor activity areas. If noise mitigation is indicated by the Phase II noise study, the plans shall be revised to show all noise mitigation measures required to achieve acceptable noise levels of 65 dBA Ldn or less.
  4. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, the following revisions shall be made:
    - a. The plans shall be revised to remove all structures proposed within the public utility easement.
    - b. The plans shall be revised to show sidewalk connections from the public rights-of-way to the internal sidewalk system. Crosswalks at each of the entrances of the site and at appropriate internal pedestrian crossings shall also be shown.
    - c. The plans shall be revised to locate all freestanding signage ten feet from the ultimate right-of-way line unless otherwise allowed by written agreement by SHA or DPW&T. Signs shall be setback sufficient distance to maintain unobstructed lines of vision for traffic at the entrance to the development.
    - d. The plans shall be revised to provide additional details and specifications for the freestanding walls located along the rights-of-way, including the material designation which shall be compatible with the building.
    - e. The storm drain catch basin proposed at the dumpster located at the southwest corner of the

site shall be separated from the dumpster.

- f. The freestanding sign shown on the Detailed Site Plan near the southeast entrance shall be moved out of the right-of-way, unless otherwise allowed by written agreement by DPW&T.
- g. The raised median shown on the plan shall conform to DPW&T standards, and shall limit traffic movements at this access point to only right-in and right-out. The proposed exclusive right-turn lane along eastbound MD 214 shall be extended south along Addison Road to the proposed driveway.
- h. The plans shall be revised to clearly indicate the finish material of the retaining wall along the rear property line and the wall shall be textured and/or stained to provide an attractive finish.
- i. The plans shall be revised to indicate the color of the vinyl board-on-board fence proposed at the southern property line, which fence shall be compatible with the colors of the building. The fence should be deleted in the southwest corner where slopes exceed 4:1.
- j. The plans shall be revised in the front courtyard of the building to show the following:
  - i. A minimum four-foot-wide sidewalk shall be provided to allow pedestrians to move from the front of the building to the east side of the building.
  - ii. Handicap spaces shall be dispersed over the site.
  - iii. Flag poles or an art piece in the center island shall be provided.
  - iv. An area of outdoor seating should be provided in conjunction with a tenant use, such as a restaurant or coffee shop.
- k. The plans shall be revised to provide the calculations and plant materials necessary to comply with Section 4.1, Residential Planting Requirements.
- l. The plans shall be revised to show ornamental light poles and luminaires (consistent with previous detailed site plan approvals within the Addison south subarea) in the front of the building and along the street line of Addison Road, subject to DPW&T approval.
- m. The applicant shall consult with all the affected utility companies to develop cost estimates for the undergrounding of utilities for review by the Planning Board for a final determination.
- n. The plans shall be revised to add a note that a sign shall be added at the access point at Zelma Avenue, to state that all loading trucks are prohibited from entering at that location and trucks must use the Addison Road entrance. The location of the sign shall be shown on

the plan.

- o. The common sign plan shall be revised to indicate that the building-mounted signage shall not exceed more than 3 colors.
- 5. All mechanical equipment and dumpsters shall be screened from public view and rights-of-way with an appropriate buffer consisting of plantings, walls or fences in compliance with the screening requirements of the Landscape Manual.
- 6. Prior to the approval of any building permit, the applicant shall provide evidence of a contribution to the M-NCPPC Department of Parks and Recreation in the amount of \$57,138 for the development of the Rollins Avenue neighborhood park.
- 7. In conformance with the Adopted and Approved Addison Road Metro Town Center and Vicinity Sector Plan, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assigns shall provide the following:
  - a. Construct the eight-foot wide sidewalk along the subject's entire frontage of Central Avenue (MD 214). This sidewalk shall be separated from the curb by a five-foot-wide grass planting strip.
  - b. Construct the eight-foot wide sidewalk along the subject site's entire frontage of Central Avenue (MD 214).
  - c. Construct the five-foot wide sidewalk along the subject site's entire frontage of Zelma Avenue. This sidewalk shall be separated from the curb by a five-foot-wide grass planting strip.
- 8. Any improvements located within WMATA's right-of-way shall be reviewed and approved by WMATA prior to certificate of approval.
- 9. Final design and material selection for the front courtyard shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Board or its designee.

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 Squire, seconded by Commissioner Eley, with Commissioners Squire, Eley voting in favor of the motion, with Commissioner Clark absent, with Commissioner Parker recusing, and with



Commissioner Vaughns abstaining at its regular meeting held on Thursday, September 21, 2006, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 19<sup>th</sup> day of October 2006.

Trudye Morgan Johnson  
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin  
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:SL:bjs