

C O R R E C T E D R E S O L U T I O N

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

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on November 16, 2006 regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-06019 for Inglewood Business Community, Part of Lot 39, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The subject application is for approval of a detailed site plan for a three-story office building in the I-3 Zone. The original request for a variance from the rear yard setback requirements of Section 27-474(b) of the Zoning Ordinance has been removed from the application by the applicant.
2. **Development Data Summary**

	Existing	Proposed
Zone(s)	I-3	I-3
Use(s)	N/A	Office
Acreage	2.32	2.32
Lots	1	1
Parcels	1	1
Square Footage/GFA	N/A	25,368

Other Development Data

	Required	Provided
Total parking spaces	67	121
Of which standard spaces	64	96
Handicapped spaces	3	5
Loading Space	1	1

3. **Location:** The site is located in Planning Area 73, Council District 6. More specifically, it is situated on the west side of Caraway Court, 350 feet south of McCormick Drive.
4. **Surroundings and Use:** The property in which the subject site is located is part of an assemblage of land known as the Inglewood Business Community. The subject site is part of Lot 39 of Conceptual Site Plan SP-80034. It is also Lot 39 of Preliminary Plan 4-80112 and 4-82133.

The property is undeveloped and is located on the west side of Caraway Court, 350 feet south of McCormick Drive. It abuts Arena Drive to the southwest and the ramps from Arena Drive to the Capital Beltway to the west. To the north and east are office uses developing in the Inglewood Business Community.

5. **Previous Approvals:** The subject site has a previously approved Conceptual Site Plan, SP-80034, Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-80112, 4-82133, and 4-05072, and Stormwater Management Concept Plan 9451-2005-00.
6. **Design Features:** The proposed office building is a two-story steel frame building with a gross floor area of 25,368 square feet and a building height of 28 feet. It is located on the northern end of the site facing Caraway Court and is surrounded on two sides by surface parking areas. Two driveways provide the access to the site from Caraway Court.

The office building facade consists of two primary features. The main entrances of the building are composed of two-story glass and metal panel walls centered on the front and rear elevations that front Caraway Court and the rear parking area. The remaining front and sides of the building elevations are a composition of two continuous bands of tinted glazing that wrap all four facades combined with three bands of brick veneer panels. The roof of the building is a flat roof. The roofline is primarily a straight parapet with a featured bump up of the front parapet designed to articulate the building entrance glass and aluminum paneled wall. The building is rectangular in shape with equal lengths on each side. The brick banding is slightly detailed with soldier coursing and brick piers that articulate the building facades.

The office building has achieved a unity of design through compatible materials and colors; selected building materials that are durable, attractive and have low maintenance requirements; and the utilization of colors that reflect natural tones. The buildings are constructed and clad with quality materials that will retain their appearance over time, including brick, aluminum, painted steel, and glass.

A signage package has not been submitted for the office building. The signage should be scaled appropriately to appeal to both pedestrians walking on the adjacent sidewalks and to vehicles driving at reduced speeds. The signs will be required to be aesthetically pleasing and cohesive. The signage on the street frontages will be required to be integrated into the overall design of the buildings.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA:

7. **Zoning Ordinance:** The subject application has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements in the I-3 Zone and the site plan design guidelines of the Zoning Ordinance.

Conformance with Section 27-471—I-3 (Planned Industrial/Employment Park)

The subject application is in general conformance with Section 27-471. Office parks are a permitted use in the I-3 Zone. Staff offers the following more detailed comments regarding compliance with the subject section:

The proposed project is in conformance with Section 27-471(a), Purposes. Likewise, the proposed project is generally in compliance with Section 27-471(b), Landscaping, Screening

and Buffering (see more detailed discussion under Finding 10, *Landscape Manual*). Section 27-471(c) prohibits outdoor storage, which should not be a problem given the proposed office use. Section 27-471(d) requires that both a conceptual and detailed site plan be approved for all uses and improvements on the subject property. Such a conceptual plan has been approved for the project. (Please see Finding 5, Previous Approvals.) At the time of the detailed site plan review, Section 27-471(d) stipulates that landscaping and the design and size of lettering, lighting, and all other features of signs proposed will be evaluated. Section 27-471(e) and the Table of Uses (Division 3, Part 7) include professional offices as a permitted use for the subject property. Section 27-471(f), Regulations, citing requirements in Divisions I and 5 of Part 7, the Regulations Tables (Division 4, Part 7), General (Part 2), Off -Street Parking and Loading (Part 12), and the *Landscape Manual* specifically requires that not more than 25 percent of any parking lot and no loading spaces be located in the yard to which the building's main entrance is oriented, except a 15 percent increase may be approved by the Planning Board in accordance with guidance from the Zoning Ordinance. The site plan is in accordance with the 25 percent requirement. Additionally, Section 27-471(f), as applied to the subject application, prohibits the location of loading docks on any side of a building facing a street. Section 27-471(g) is inapplicable to the subject application as it establishes requirements for warehousing, not an anticipated use on the subject site. Section 27-471(h) reiterates and expounds on the requirements of 27-455.01, stating that each planned industrial/ employment park shall have frontage on, and direct vehicular access to, a street having a right-of-way width of at least 70 feet. The proposed project meets the requirements of Section 27-471(i) since the proposed site measures in excess of 25 gross acres.

8. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision:** The Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, 4-05072, is a resubdivision of Lot 39 in the Conceptual Site Plan SP-80034, which was approved by the Prince George's County Planning Board on January 5, 2006.
9. ***Landscape Manual:*** The proposed development is subject to the requirements of Section 4.2, Commercial and Industrial Landscaped Strip, 4.3.a, Parking Lot Landscape Strip, 4.3.b, Parking Lot Perimeter Strip, and 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, of the *Landscape Manual*.

Urban Design staff reviewed the proposed landscape plan and found that the submittals are in general compliance with the applicable sections of the *Landscape Manual*.

10. **Woodland Conservation Ordinance:** The property on which the detailed site plan is proposed is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because the entire site has over 40,000 square feet of gross tract area and contains more than 10,000 square feet of existing woodland.
11. **Referral Comments:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:

Historic Preservation—In a memorandum dated September 29, 2006, the Historic Preservation Planning Section stated the proposed project would have no effect on designated historic resources.

Archeology—In a memorandum dated September 29, 2006, the archeological reviewer stated that no archeological review is required at detailed site plan.

Community Planning— In a memorandum dated September 11, 2006, the Community Planning Division stated that the application is not inconsistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies for the Developing Tier and that the application is in conformance with the land use recommendations of the Largo-Lottsford and Vicinity Master Plan (1990) for employment uses. The 2004 *Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Morgan Boulevard and Largo Town Center Metro Areas* contains no land use recommendation for this site.

Transportation—In a memorandum dated October 2, 2006, the Transportation Planning Section stated that the proposed Detailed Site Plan (DSP-06019) is for the office development on the 2.30 acres lot. The plan proposes 25,368 gross square feet of general office in a two-story office building with 121 surface parking spaces. Using the recommended trip generation rates for a medical/professional office, an allowed use, the proposed development is expected to generate 72 AM and 97 PM peak-hour trips. At this time a detailed site plan has not been submitted for the proposed 208 hotel rooms on Lot 56. The approval of this detailed site plan would reduce the maximum development levels for the remaining lot to 244,632 gross square feet, or an equivalent development that generates no more than 468 AM and 403 PM peak-hour trips.

The proposed site only has one entrance to Caraway Court. Although on-site circulation is acceptable, it would be more desirable to have a secondary point of access/egress for the proposed entrance drive to proposed lot 56. The plan also proposes 121 surface parking spaces, exceeding the minimum required number of parking spaces to be provided by 54 spaces.

As part of this submission, the applicant also requests a variance of 14 feet from the required rear yard setback. This request does not create any transportation-related issues, but it should be noted that the plan shows about 34 of the additional parking spaces will be located within the total required rear setback.

Given these findings, the Transportation Planning section believes that the needed findings for the approval of this detailed site plan, from the perspective of transportation, are met, provided the proposed location of access driveway from Caraway Court is acceptable by DPW&T.

Urban Design Comment: The variance request is no longer applicable since the date this memorandum was written.

Subdivision—In a memorandum dated October 16, 2006, the Subdivision Section offered the following:

The property is the subject of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-05072, approved by the Planning Board on December 15, 2005, for two lots pursuant to PGCPB Resolution No. 05-266. The development is proposed for part of existing Lot 39 of the Inglewood Business Community. This corresponds to Lot 55 as shown on Preliminary Plan 4-05072, which is not yet recorded in the Prince George's County Land Records. As approved, this section of the Inglewood Business Community is limited to the equivalent of 270,000 square feet of office space or equivalent development that generates no more than 540 AM and 500 PM peak-hour vehicle trips.

Development of the property is subject to the conditions contained in the resolution of approval. That resolution contains one condition that impacts the review of the detailed site plan:

- “7. The applicant and the applicant’s heirs, successors, and assignees shall provide the following:
 - “a. A standard sidewalk along the subject site's entire frontage of Caraway Court unless modified by DPW&T.
 - “b. The appropriateness of a multiuse trail connection within a public use easement from Caraway Court to Arena Drive shall be determined at the time of detailed site plan.”

The subject DSP shows the standard sidewalk along Caraway Court. The possible public use easement for a trail connection was contemplated for a lot further to the south. However, it may be prudent to have the trails coordinator review the plan for completeness.

The resolution also contains a condition relating to the total development and vehicle trips for this development. The transportation planning staff should assess the plan's conformance to this condition. Subdivision staff has no comments at this time regarding the variance request.

There are no other subdivision issues at this time.

Trails— In a memorandum dated October 27, 2006, the senior trails planner offered the following:

The adopted and approved Morgan Boulevard and Largo Town Center Metro Areas Sector Plan recommends a trail connection from the end of Caraway Court to Arena Drive in the vicinity of the subject site. Recommendation 4 on page 43 states:

“Provide a multiuse trail connection from the end of Caraway Court to Arena Drive. This trail would provide a convenient pedestrian connection from the existing and future office development along McCormick Drive with Arena Drive and the former Capital Centre site to the south.”

This proposed connection was discussed at the time of preliminary plan. The subject site's frontage of Arena Drive is located where the ramps from the Capital Beltway merge with Arena Drive, thus making a pedestrian crossing across Arena Drive to the Boulevard at Cap Centre difficult at this location. In addition, there is not an existing sidewalk along the north side of Arena Drive immediately outside the Beltway, making pedestrian access across Lot 40 not practical at this time. Due to these constraints, it was determined that an adjoining property may be the most appropriate location for the pedestrian connection to Arena Drive. The applicant has confirmed that a pedestrian connection is going to be provided from the parking lot on Lot 40 to Arena Drive, thus fulfilling the master plan recommendation. There are no additional recommendations regarding this proposal for the subject site.

Permits—In a memorandum dated October 12, 2006, the Permit Review Section offered numerous comments that have either been addressed by revisions to the plans or in the recommended conditions below.

Environmental Planning—In a memorandum dated September 26, 2006, the Environmental Planning Section stated that the TCPII was approved without conditions.

Department of Environmental Resources—In comments dated September 7, 2006, DER stated that the site plan for Inglewood Business Community, P/O Lot 39, DSP-06019 & VD-06019, is consistent with approved Stormwater Concept 36573-2006.

Fire Department—In a memorandum dated August 10, 2006, the Specials Operation Command Bureau of Fire Prevention, Special Hazards Section, provided comments that require incorporation into the final plat and a condition of release of the use and occupancy permit.

Department of Public Works & Transportation (DPW&T)—In a memorandum dated August 16, 2006, DPW&T offered the following:

- The property is located on the west side of Caraway Court, approximately 800 feet south of McCormick Drive. Right-of-way dedication and frontage improvements in accordance with DPW&T's urban commercial road standards are provided for Caraway Court. Replacement of curb and gutter and sidewalk that has deteriorated is required.
- Full width, two-inch mill and overlay for all county roadway frontages are required.
- Street trees and streetlights have been provided along Lottsford Road frontage. The developer will be required to place additional lights and trees in conformance with DPW&T's standards.
- Sidewalks are required along the roadways within the property limits in accordance with Sections 23-105 and 23-135 of the County Road Ordinance.

- All storm drainage systems and facilities are to be in accordance with DPW&T's and the Department of Environmental Resources' requirements.
 - An access study shall be conducted by the applicant and reviewed to determine the adequacy of access point(s) and the need for acceleration/deceleration and turning lanes.
12. As required by Section 27-285(b) of the Zoning Ordinance, the detailed site plan represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines of Subtitle 27, Part 3, Division 9, of the Prince George's County Code without requiring unreasonable cost and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Subtitle 27 of the Prince George's County Code, the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission adopted the findings contained herein and APPROVED the Type II Tree Conservation Plan *(TCPII/[85]130/05) and further APPROVED Detailed Site Plan DSP-06019 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to the certification of the detailed site plan, the site plan and elevations shall be revised with the following conditions:
 - a. Provide screening for all rooftop equipment.
 - b. Provide parapets concealing flat roof and rooftop equipment such as HVAC units from public view area. (Provide detailed sections illustrating the height of the parapet and setback of rooftop mechanical equipment that complies with this condition.
 - c. Provide ornamental plant material, such as ornamental trees, flowering shrubs and perennials, and ground covers at the building foundations.
 - d. Submit a signage package for review and approval by the staff. The package shall include signage that complements the architectural features of the building such as above the building entrance or other similar feature.

*Denotes Correction

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] indicate deleted language

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, Clark, Vaughns and Parker, voting in favor of the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, November 16, 2006, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 16th day of November 2006.

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:EE:bjs