



Comment [COMMENT1]: WHEN INSERTING INFORMATION AT THE @ SIGN REMEMBER TO USE INDENT FOR SECOND LINE - NOT TAB. ALSO, IT WILL LOOK LIKE THE TEXT IS GOING WACKO, BUT DON'T WORRY - IT IS FINE.

DETAILED SITE PLAN DSP-00044

Application	General Data
Project Name GOLDEN TRIANGLE, RESIDENCE INN	Date Accepted 10-24-00
	Planning Board Action Limit WAIVED
Location Located northwest of the intersection of MD 193 and Walker Drive, at the terminus of Golden Triangle Drive.	ZHE Hearing Date N/A
	Plan Acreage 3.5078 ACRES
Applicant/Address BRENTWOOD HOTELS 1564 CROSSWAY BOULEVARD CHESAPEAKE, VA 23320	Zone C-O
	Dwelling Units N/A
	Square Footage 92,757 SF
	Planning Area 67
	Council District 04
	Municipality GREENBELT
	200-Scale Base Map 210NE06

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates
APPROVAL OF A DETAILED SITE PLAN FOR A HOTEL IN THE C-O ZONE.	Adjoining Property Owners (CB-15-1998) 10-20-00
	Previous Parties of Record (CB-13-1997) 01-17-01
	Sign(s) Posted on Site 01-12-01
	Variance(s): Adjoining Property Owners N/A

Staff Recommendation			Staff Reviewer
APPROVAL	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS	DISAPPROVAL	WHITMORE
	X		

July 30, 2009

MEMORANDUM:

TO: Prince George's County Planning Board

VIA: Steve Adams, Urban Design Supervisor

FROM: Elizabeth Whitmore, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: Detailed Site Plan, SP-00044
Golden Triangle, Residence Inn, Lot 24

The Urban Design staff has completed its review of Detailed Site Plan SP-00044, Lot 24, for Golden Triangle, Residence Inn. The following evaluation and findings lead to a recommendation of Approval with Conditions for the Detailed Site Plan as described in the Recommendation Section of this report. This report addresses the required findings for the Detailed Site Plan.

EVALUATION

The Detailed Site Plan was reviewed and evaluated for conformance with the following criteria:

- a. Conformance to the Zoning Ordinance.
- b. Conformance to Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, 4-85060.
- c. Conformance to the requirements of the *Landscape Manual*.
- e. Conformance to the requirements of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance.
- f. Referral comments.

FINDINGS

Based upon evaluation and analysis of the subject application, the Urban Design staff recommends the following findings:

1. This Detailed Site Plan is for the purpose of approval of a hotel with 120 rooms, and a gatehouse that houses an exercise room, storage rooms, laundry facilities, meeting room with kitchen facilities (for hotel guests only), and administrative offices. The subject property is located at the northeast quadrant of the intersection of Kenilworth Avenue and Greenbelt Road. The property is bound by Kenilworth Avenue to the west, developed commercial

properties, hotel and commercial/professional offices zoned C-S-C and C-O to the south, and vacant properties zoned C-O and O-S to the north and east. The Detailed Site Plan includes the site plan, landscape plan, tree conservation plan and architecture.

2. The subject site has a prior approval, SP-97054 (PGCPB No.98-31), approved by the Prince George's County Planning Board on February 19, 1998. The validity period for this approval will expire on February 19, 2001. It should be noted that the plans for SP-97054 were never certified.
3. The 1989 Master Plan for Langley Park, College Park and Greenbelt recommends that the subject property be developed for office/commercial uses. The 1990 Sectional Map Amendment rezoned the property from C-2 to C-O. The proposed use will not impair the integrity of the master plan.
4. The Preliminary Plat, 4-85060, was approved by the Planning Board on July 18, 1985. The Preliminary Plat was approved with conditions that required Detailed Site Plan review prior to the issuance of permits, as follows:

a. Approval of a site plan by the Prince George's County Planning Board for each lot prior to the approval of building permits. The site plan review shall include:

1. Site analysis in regard to natural development constraints.

Comment: There are no significant environmental impacts associated with the development of the subject property. There are no priority woodlands on-site. The site does not contain any steep or severe slopes. The existing Kenilworth Avenue to the west provides the only constraints in terms of building location and views. The issue of Kenilworth Avenue and its proximity to the subject property has been adequately addressed through orienting the buildings away from this thoroughfare, preserving existing landscape buffering and providing screening where necessary, and manipulation of the on-site topography so that views of the hotel from the roadways would be reduced.

2. General location of proposed land uses on the site.

Comment: Staff has reviewed the general location of proposed land uses for the subject site and supports the layout shown on the plan.

3. Relationship of the proposed uses to access, internal circulation, parking and open space.

Comment: The proposed uses are provided access by one main entrance road, Golden Triangle Drive.

Internal circulation is barrier-free throughout the subject property. The plan layout provides for vehicular movement in a continuous unobstructed circular loop path around the entire site and building perimeters. Parking is conveniently provided along this circular loop.

4. Landscaping proposals with particular regard to visibility of the property from the Capital Beltway.

Comment: Lots 26 and 27 separate Lot 24 from the Capital Beltway, (I-495). The view of Lot 24 from the Beltway will be significantly obstructed by the intervening development. Therefore, the proposed application is not subject to this condition.

5. Design of signs.

Comment: The subject plan proposes building-mounted signs, but no detailed drawings of the signs have been submitted. The applicant had not submitted to the Urban Design Section any proposal for site entrance signage features as of the writing of this report. This information must be provided on the site plan and include appropriate details. The location, monument sign design, and details should be provided.

b. The site plan review shall also include:

1. Two easements of land be provided for access to a pedestrian/ bicycle overpass in the event it is possible to bridge the Capital Beltway and Kenilworth Avenue. The Capital Beltway overpass should tie in with the Lakeside West Subdivision and the Board suggests this access be granted through the green area adjacent to the southwest corner of Indian Springs Park. The access on the Kenilworth Avenue side is to be determined at a future time.

Comment: The bicycle/pedestrian overpass at the Beltway does not impact the subject property, and should be addressed at the time of development of Lot 27.

Furthermore, pertaining to the condition requiring an easement for an overpass over Kenilworth Avenue, the previous Planning Board Resolution (PGCPB No. 98-31) stated the following:

■A determination as to whether it will be possible in the future to provide a pedestrian/bicycle overpass at Kenilworth Avenue, or at what point along Kenilworth Avenue this would occur has not been made at this point. Staff is not aware of any study that has occurred involving this issue. For these reasons, at this time it would be extremely difficult to precisely choose a location for the conditioned easement. Prior to submission of the final plan, the applicant presented a conceptual sketch plan to the City of

Greenbelt in which the preferred location for future pedestrian bridge is designated just north of the property lines between the hotel, Lot 26, and the office building, Lot 27, in the southwest corner of Lot 27. Although not noted on the concept sketch plan, the required easement would be located in this general area. The City of Greenbelt approved this location, and staff concurs with the City's assessment.

The staff supports reapproval of the previously approved preferred location. Because that location is not within the boundaries of Lot 24 or the subject Detailed Site Plan, it is recommended that, for informational purposes only, the same proposed conceptual location for said easement should be shown north of the northernmost lot-line of Lot 24. Staff recommends that the exact location of said easement be determined at the time of submittal of Detailed Site Plan for Lot 26 and/or Lot 27. This issue should be negotiated between this or other applicants and the City of Greenbelt at a later date.

5. The subject application is for the construction of a hotel and gatehouse. The site development data is as follows:

Zone	CO
Gross Tract Area	3.50 acres
Proposed Square Feet	
Hotel	86,225 square feet
Gatehouse	6,532 square feet
Total	92,757 square feet
Parking Required	
Hotel 120 rooms (1 sp. per 2 guest rooms)	60 spaces
Gatehouse (1 sp per every 3 seats in eating area of guesthouse)	12 spaces
Handicapped	3 spaces
Total	75 spaces
Parking Provided	
Standard Spaces (9.5' x 19')	88 spaces
Compact Spaces (8' x 16.5')	28 spaces
Handicapped spaces	
Standard (8' x 19' with 5' access aisle)	4 spaces
Van Accessible (8' x 19' with 5' access aisle)	1 space
Total	122 spaces
Loading Required	1 space
Loading Provided	1 space
Interior Green Required	
46,765 square feet area of parking compound	5% or 2,338 square feet

Interior Green Provided

5.5% or 2,560 square feet

6. The Urban Design Section has reviewed the site plan and finds the proposed hotel building architecture to be an attractive four-story building. A one-story gatehouse is also proposed that houses laundry facilities, an exercise room, meeting room with kitchen facilities (for hotel guests only), storage areas and administrative offices. The landscape plan indicates buffering along the west side of the subject property. Therefore, the hotel and gatehouse will barely be visible from Kenilworth Avenue. The proposed structures will not be visible from the Beltway (I-495). The proposed hotel will be finished with a prefabricated material, E.I.F.S., that gives an appearance very similar to stucco. The applicant is proposing to use a combination of two main colors, Bungalow Beige and Sanderling. Horizontal bands as accents of Sanderling will be incorporated between each floor to avoid a monotonous facade. These colors will be accented with white window trim, exterior doors, and gutters.
7. The Environmental Planning Section in a memorandum dated November 3, 2000 (Stasz to Whitmore) offered the following comments:
 - This site is subject to the provisions of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance, because the site is more than 40,000 square feet in size and contains more than 10,000 square feet of woodland. A Tree Conservation Plan is required.
 - A Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/119/97, has been reviewed. The plan proposes the clearing of .67 acres of woodland. The worksheet correctly indicates a required woodland conservation minimum of 1.07 acres. The plan proposes retention of .04 acres of woodland, the reforestation of .28 acres, and an off-site equivalent of .75 acres on the Manchester Estates Property, TCPII/129/99.
 - As a technical detail, the .28 acres listed as afforestation should be listed as reforestation.
 - Staff has reviewed TCPII/119/97 and recommends approval for the following reasons:
 - a. In general we seek 15% total green space in intense developments. The combination of woodland conservation and landscaping approach this goal.
 - b. There are no priority woodlands on-site.
 - c. The off-site location will further the goals of countywide woodland conservation efforts.
 - It should be noted that the off-site woodland conservation requirement must be fulfilled prior to the issuance of any permit.

Conditions 1.d and 2 in the Recommendation Section of this report address the above concerns.

8. The subject application was referred to the Permit Review Section and in a memorandum dated February 4, 1997, several issues were identified. All were addressed except for the following:
 - a. The ultimate right-of-way of Kenilworth Avenue should be labeled on the site plan.
 - b. The height of the maintenance building should be provided on the site plan.
 - c. A detail of the dumpster enclosure should be provided on the plans.

Conditions 1.e, 1.f, and 1.g in the Recommendation Section of this report address the above concerns.

9. The Community Planning Division has determined that the application does not raise any Master Plan issues and has no effect on historic properties.
10. The City of Greenbelt in a memorandum dated December 20, 2000 (Davis to Hewlett) offered the following comments:

■The Greenbelt City Council on December 18, 2000, voted unanimously to support the revised Detailed Site Plan for Golden Triangle (DSP-00044) subject to the following conditions:

- 1. The applicant provides a revised sign detail for the proposed 8'- 2 1/4" freestanding sign showing landscaping along the base of the sign for City review and approval. The landscaping should include plants/shrubs that are 2 feet in height so that the exposed area of the sign does not exceed 6-feet. The applicant further agrees that all signs must be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to installation.
- 2. A note should be placed on the Detailed Site Plan showing approximate location for a future pedestrian/bicycle overpass at Kenilworth Avenue. The applicant agrees that the exact location of the easement will be negotiated with the City at the appropriate time.
- 3. A development-tracking chart should be provided on the cover sheet with tabulations for the square footage (gross floor area) of all existing and proposed development.

■In regard to the condition referencing an easement for a future pedestrian/bicycle overpass at Kenilworth Avenue, it is imperative that such an agreement provide for public access to a landing area, as well as public access through the subject property to provide for a connection to public right-of-way. Without such a connection, the pedestrian/bicycle overpass cannot serve a public purpose.●

Finding 4.b.1 and Conditions 1.a and 1.b in the Recommendation Section of this report address the above referenced concerns.

11. The subject site has an approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan (CSD #008004870), which was approved on April 10, 2000.
12. The Detailed Site Plan meets the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance for development in the C-O Zone.
13. The subject application is in conformance with the requirements of the *Landscape Manual*.
14. The Transportation Planning Section found the plans acceptable as submitted. There are no master plan trails recommended.
15. 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.

RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the preceding evaluation and findings, the Urban Design Section recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and APPROVE SP-97054 and TCPII/119/97, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certificate approval the following revisions shall be made to the Detailed Site Plan:
 - a. The plans shall be revised to include sign details for the proposed 8'- 2 1/4" freestanding sign showing landscaping along the base of the sign. The landscaping shall include plants/shrubs that are 2 feet in height so that the exposed area of the sign does not exceed 6-feet. The location of all signage shall be shown on the Detailed Site Plan. All signage shall be reviewed by the City of Greenbelt.
 - b. Provide on the cover sheet a development tracking chart with tabulations for the square footage (gross floor area) of all existing development in Golden Triangle, the corresponding permit numbers, and the proposed development with its square footage.
 - c. The plans shall be revised to show a proposed conceptual location of an easement for a pedestrian/bicycle overpass north of the northernmost lot line of Lot 24.
 - d. The TCPII shall be revised to state the .28 acres listed as afforestation shall be reforestation.
 - e. The ultimate right-of-way of Kenilworth Avenue shall be labeled.
 - f. The height of the maintenance building shall be provided on the site plan.
 - g. The plans shall be revised to include a detail of the dumpster enclosure.
2. Prior to issuance of any permit, off-site woodland conservation requirements shall be fulfilled.