



*Note: Staff reports can be accessed at [www.mncppc.org/pgco/planning/plan.htm](http://www.mncppc.org/pgco/planning/plan.htm).*

## Detailed Site Plan

## DSP-06001-01

Application	General Data	
<b>Project Name:</b> Commons at Addison Road, Icon Property  <b>Location:</b> Southwest quadrant of the intersection of Central Avenue (MD 214) and Addison Road, with frontage on Zelma Avenue  <b>Applicant/Address:</b> Dawn Limited Partnership 4219 Dustin Road Burtonsville, MD 20866	Planning Board Hearing Date:	04/08/10
	Staff Report Date:	03/25/10
	Date Accepted:	01/21/10
	Planning Board Action Limit:	Waived
	Plan Acreage:	2.9791
	Zone:	C-S-C/R-55
	Dwelling Units:	171
	Gross Floor Area:	22,696 sq. ft.
	Planning Area:	75A
	Tier:	Developed
	Council District:	07
	Election District	18
	Municipality:	N/A
	200-Scale Base Map:	201SE06

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates	
Mixed-Use development with 171 dwelling units, 37,170 square feet of office, a 32,820-square-foot library, 15,890 square feet of retail, a freestanding parking structure and indoor pool building.	Informational Mailing:	01/15/09
	Acceptance Mailing:	01/19/10
	Sign Posting Deadline:	03/09/10

Staff Recommendation		Staff Reviewer: Jeanette Silor	
APPROVAL	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS	DISAPPROVAL	DISCUSSION
	X		

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL  
PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Detailed Site Plan DSP-06001-01  
Commons at Addison Road

The Urban Design staff has reviewed the detailed site plan for the subject property and presents the following evaluation and findings leading to a recommendation of APPROVAL with conditions, as described in the Recommendation Section of this report.

EVALUATION

The detailed site plan was reviewed and evaluated for compliance with the following criteria:

- a. The requirements of Preliminary Plans of Subdivision 4-05068 and 4-08019.
- b. The approved plans for Detailed Site Plan DSP-06001.
- c. The requirements of the October 2000 *Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Addison Road Metro Town Center and Vicinity*.
- d. The requirements of the Zoning Ordinance in the C-S-C (Commercial Shopping Center) Zone and the R-55 (One-Family Detached Residential) Zone.
- e. The requirements of the Development District Overlay Zone (DDOZ).
- f. The requirements of the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*.
- g. The requirements of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance.
- h. Referral comments.

## FINDINGS

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

1. **Request:** The subject application requests approval of a revision to a detailed site plan for a mixed-use development including 171 multifamily units, 15,890 square feet of retail, 37,170 square feet of office, a 32,820-square-foot public library, and a freestanding, four-story parking garage to be constructed in two phases in the C-S-C Zone. A 4,973-square-foot enclosed swimming pool building or natatorium is proposed in the R-55 Zone. Land area (Parcel B and Lot 5) is proposed to be added to the development for the construction of the parking garage (on Parcel B) and the natatorium (Lot 5).

### 2. Development Data Summary

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone	C-S-C/R-55	C-S-C/R-55
Use(s)	Vacant/residential	Mixed-Use
Acreage	2.98 (2.75 in the C-S-C/DDO and .23 in the R-55/DDO)	2.98 (2.75 in the C-S-C/DDO and .23 in the R-55/DDO)
Parcels (Total)	2	2
Lots (Total)	1	1
Square Footage/GFA	0	325,123

### PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

	Phase 1	Phase 2	Garage	Total	Approved with DSP-06001	Change from Original Approval
Multifamily (1 BR)	73	6	0	<b>79</b>	54	+25
Multifamily (2 BR)	49	42	0	<b>91</b>	115	-24
Multifamily (3 BR)	1	0	0	<b>1</b>	0	+1
Multifamily Total	123	48	0	<b>171</b>	169	+2
Office (sf)	37,170	0	0	<b>37,170</b>	34,921	+2,249
Library (sf)	32,820	0	0	<b>32,820</b>	31,380	+1,440
Retail (sf)	9,340	0	6,550	<b>15,890</b>	20,609	-4,719

## **PARKING TABULATION\***

### **PHASE 1**

<b>REQUIRED</b>	<b>353</b>
Multifamily (1.33 per unit + .33 for each bedroom over one)	
1 Bedroom (73)	97.09
2 Bedroom (49)	81.34
3 Bedroom (1)	1.99
Commercial (1 per 250 sf/2)	171.76
85,880 sf total	171.76

### **PHASE 2**

<b>REQUIRED</b>	<b>78</b>
Multifamily (1.33 per unit + .33 for each bedroom over one)	
1 Bedroom (6)	7.98
2 Bedroom (42)	69.72
3 Bedroom (0)	-

<b>TOTAL REQUIRED</b>	<b>431</b>
-----------------------	------------

<b>TOTAL PROVIDED</b>	<b>372**</b>
<b>(ALL WITHIN PHASE 1)</b>	

Adjacent Garage	
Regular	233
Handicap	12
Total	245
Surface Spaces	
Regular	29
Handicap	2
Total	31
Main Garage	
Regular	92
Handicap	4
Total	96

\*The Proposed Development table on the coversheet of the plans should be revised to correspond with the phasing outlined in the above parking schedule. The parking schedule on the plans contains minor errors. The parking schedule should be revised in accordance with the above tabulation prior to signature approval of the detailed site plan.

\*\*DSP-06001 was approved by the District Council with a condition that required only a minimum of 300 parking spaces within a parking structure. As demonstrated by the table above, the proposal includes a total of 372 parking spaces, 341 of which are proposed to be provided within parking structures. Therefore, sufficient parking has been provided for the proposed

development.

## LOADING TABULATION

<b>Required</b>	
Multifamily (171 units)	1
Retail (15,890 square feet)	2
Library (32,820)	1
Office (37,170 square feet)	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Provided</b>	<b>5</b>

\*The detailed site plan does not but should include a loading schedule.

3. **Location:** The site is located in Planning Area 75A, Council District 7, and the Developed Tier. More specifically, it is located in the southwest quadrant of the intersection of Central Avenue (MD 214) and Addison Road, across from the Addison Road Metro Station. The site is also located within the town commons, subarea 3-Metro West portion of the Addison Road Metro (ARM) Center.
4. **Surrounding Uses:** The subject property is bounded to the north by Central Avenue with commercial land use beyond; to the west by Zelma Avenue with single-family detached residential uses beyond; to the south by single-family detached residential uses; and to the east by Addison Road with the Addison Road Metro Station beyond.
5. **Previous Approvals:** Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-05068 was approved by the Planning Board on February 9, 2006 (PGCPB Resolution No. 06-37) for Parcel A, on which the main mixed-use building is proposed. Detailed Site Plan DSP-06001 was subsequently approved by the Planning Board on September 21, 2006 (PGCPB Resolution No. 06-217) for a mixed-use development to include 170 multifamily units and 22,696 square feet of commercial uses within one, eight-story building. The District Council elected to review the case and affirmed the Planning Board decision with additional conditions on May 15, 2007. The additional conditions required the addition of library and office uses and an increase in the building height up to ten stories. On June 2, 2008, the District Council approved a Revised Condition 4.m., which relates to the undergrounding of utilities. Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-08019 was approved by the Planning Board on September 25, 2008 (PGCPB Resolution No. 08-124) for Parcel 87, on which the freestanding parking garage is proposed. The site is also the subject of approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan 24628-2005-01.
6. **Design Features:** With this application, the applicant is proposing to construct the previously approved building on Parcel A in two phases. The building design and footprint are virtually identical to those shown on the approved plans for Detailed Site Plan DSP-06001. Revisions proposed to the architectural elevations have resulted in minor modifications to the previously approved building footprint; however, the building location, shape, set back and overall dimensions are consistent with the approved building. The building's main entrance is oriented toward Central Avenue (MD 214), from which it is separated by a small surface parking facility in a courtyard design. The western portion of the building projects out from the plane on which the main entrance is located. This western "wing" of the building extends to within approximately 13 feet from the right-of-way (ROW) line of Central Avenue. The eastern portion of the building, which also projects out from the plane of the main entrance, is set back a greater distance from Central Avenue to allow access to the surface parking facility in front of the building.

With Phase 1 of the project, the applicant proposes to construct one level of underground parking and the first four floors of the entire mixed-use building on Parcel A, and the entire western portion of the building. The first floor of the building will feature the proposed library in the western portion of the building, separate lobbies for the residential and office/library uses, and retail in the eastern portion of the building, which is accessed from the exterior of the building. The second floor will feature the second level of the library in the eastern portion of the building, and office space in the western portion of the building. Level three will feature a second level of office space in the eastern portion of the building and residential units in the western portion of the building. The residential and office uses on this floor will have separate elevator access and lobbies. The third floor also includes amenity space for use by the residents of the building including a 1,170-square-foot fitness center with locker rooms, an 890-square-foot aerobics room, a 700-square-foot business center and a 910-square-foot media center. The fourth floor features a third level of office space in the eastern portion of the building and additional residential units in the western portion of the building. Floors five through nine include residential units in the western portion of the building. The tenth floor is designed as the lower level of two-story condominium units in response to a condition of approval imposed by the District Council with Detailed Site Plan DSP-06001. An additional penthouse level is provided above the tenth floor, which includes the second level of the two-story units, additional amenity space including a 2,210-square-foot lounge and billiards room, and a rooftop area with trellises and gazebos.

The exterior architecture of the main mixed-use building is very similar to that approved with Detailed Site Plan DSP-06001 and includes high-quality materials such as cast stone masonry, face brick and dramatic cornice elements. The most notable revision is at the top of the building where metal trellis elements and an angled, glass penthouse element have been incorporated to enhance the roofline and the prominent corner at the Addison Road/Central Avenue intersection. The portion of the building that will be exposed until Phase 2 is completed will be treated with EIFS (exterior insulation finishing system) to match the brick of the building and a limited number of windows.

This application also proposes the addition of adjacent Parcel B and Lot 5, Block B to the project for the construction of a four-level parking garage partially wrapped with retail (on Parcel B) and a natatorium (on Lot 5). The parking garage is located across the internal drive that is proposed south of the main building and will front on Addison Road. The parking garage will include one level of underground parking, which will connect via an underground walkway to the underground parking proposed in association with the main mixed-use building on Parcel A. Three additional levels of parking will be provided above grade. Retail is proposed at the ground level along Addison Road and will provide active uses along the street at this prominent location across from the metro station. As such, the structure has been designed with a retail storefront façade of brick, cast stone masonry and aluminum-framed windows. The corners and entrances are defined and enhanced with metal and glass canopy elements, which mimic those proposed above entrances on the main building. The other three garage façades are treated with the same brick, cast stone masonry, and decorative cornices that are featured on the main building. The garage openings are screened with green screens and decorative painted metal grills.

East of the parking garage proposed on Parcel B, the applicant proposes to construct a one-story natatorium on Lot 5, Block B, which will house a swimming pool that will be available for use by residents of the building. In the original approval of Detailed Site Plan DSP-06001, an enclosed swimming pool was located on the rooftop of the building. The applicant is now proposing to construct a 4,973-square-foot indoor pool building instead. The building can be accessed either at grade by crossing the internal drive south of the main building or from an underground walkway

that connects the underground garage of the main building and the parking garage, which is immediately adjacent to the natatorium. A partially covered plaza area with tables and chairs is proposed between the natatorium and parking garage. The natatorium is designed with an arched roof, which echoes the arched element proposed at the penthouse level of the main building and is finished with cast stone, face brick and aluminum-framed glass curtain walls

With Phase 2 of the project, the applicant proposes to construct the remainder of the floors of residential units (the fifth floor through the penthouse level) within the eastern portion of the main mixed-use building.

## COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-05068:** Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-05068 was approved by the Planning Board on February 9, 2006 (PGCPB Resolution No. 06-37) for Parcel A, on which the main mixed-use building is proposed, subject to 18 conditions, of which the following are applicable to the review of this application and warrant discussion as follows:

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.

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

**Comment:** The site has a revised stormwater concept approval letter (24628-2005-01) because the previous approval has expired. Conformance with the stormwater management concept approval will be ensured through subsequent reviews by the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T). At the time of the writing of this technical staff report, comments have not been received from DPW&T. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, verification should be provided from DPW&T that the detailed site plan is consistent with the approved stormwater management concept plan.

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 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 65 dBA Ldn for most of Parcel A, and showed the location of the unmitigated 70 and 65 dBA Ldn noise contours related to Central Avenue and Addison Road. The location of the combined noise contour for these roadways is correctly shown on the detailed site plan.

Based on the review of the detailed site plan, the only outdoor activity area proposed is a patio on Lot 5; however, this area is not within the area impacted by noise and is located behind the

proposed building. The pool that was previously proposed on the rooftop of the building is now proposed as an indoor pool. Because there are no outdoor activity areas proposed within the noise impact area, a Phase II noise study is no longer required.

Noise impacts with regard to interior noise have also been addressed. Based on a letter dated October 5, 2006, and submitted with Detailed Site Plan DSP-06001, Phoenix Noise and Vibration reviewed the previously approved architecture and verified that the proposed materials for the residential building were sufficient to reduce interior noise levels to 45 dBA Ldn or less. A letter dated February 4, 2010, that was stamped as received by the Environmental Planning Section on February 23, 2010, states that "the proposed architecture in this application is not significantly different from the exterior materials as previously approved and therefore, the exterior envelope should not result in having interior readings greater than the 45 dBA Ldn limits." After a review of the proposed architecture and a comparison with the previously approved architecture, staff agrees that the proposed architecture in this application is consistent with the noise consultant's recommendations and should result in noise levels that are 45 dBA Ldn or less. The application for the building permit for Parcel A should contain a certification, to be submitted to The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC), prepared by a professional engineer with competency in acoustical analysis using the certification template. The certification should state that the interior noise levels have been reduced through the proposed building materials to 45 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 24628-2005-01 indicates that water quality will be provided with either bioretention or infiltration. The plans show the location of a bioretention pond at the northeast corner of the site. An infiltration trench is being provided on the east side of the site. The detailed site plan shows the bioretention area in the same location as was approved with Detailed Site Plan DSP-06001 at the intersection of Central Avenue (MD 214) and Addison Road and indicates that it will be planted with shrubs, ornamental trees and emergent plants. The Department of Public Works and Transportation 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 MNCPPC 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.**

**Comment:** At the time of review of Detailed Site Plan DSP-06001, the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) indicated that the applicant's contribution should be \$57,138 for the development of the Rollins Avenue neighborhood park, to be contributed prior to approval of any building permit. The Planning Board approved the case with a condition requiring the contribution. When the District Council reviewed the application, this condition was modified to require the contribution for the benefit of the Prince George's County Memorial Library System (Condition 6). This condition remains valid and will be enforced prior to the issuance of building permits.

- 10. 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 assignees shall provide the following:**

- a. Provide a minimum eight-foot-wide sidewalk along the subject site's entire road frontage of MD 214, unless modified by SHA.**

**Comment:** Although an eight-foot-wide sidewalk is shown along the subject site's entire frontage of Central Avenue, it is not separated from the curb by a five-foot-wide grass planting strip as is required by the above condition and the Sector Plan for a Type B sidewalk. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, the plans should be revised to show a five-foot-wide grass planting strip between the sidewalk and curb along Central Avenue.

- b. Provide a minimum eight-foot-wide sidewalk along the subject site's entire road frontage of Addison Road, unless modified by DPW&T.**

- c. Provide a standard sidewalk along the subject site's entire road frontage of Zelma Avenue, unless modified by DPW&T.**

**Comment:** The plans show an eight-foot-wide sidewalk along the subject site's entire road frontage of Addison Road and a five-foot-wide sidewalk along the sites' entire road frontage of Zelma Avenue.

- 12. The applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assignees shall submit three original Recreational Facilities Agreements (RFA) to DRD for construction of private recreational facilities, for approval prior to the submission of final plats. Upon approval by DRD, the RFA shall be recorded among the county Land Records.**

**Comment:** Pursuant to the approval of Detailed Site Plan DSP-06001, an RFA was recorded in land records. Prior to the submission of final plats, which will be required to be filed subsequent to this application, the applicant should submit a revised RFA in accordance with this detailed site plan application. The RFA should set forth triggers for the completion of the recreational facilities as follows:

- The fitness center, aerobics room, business center, media center, lounge/billiards room and indoor pool building (natatorium) shall be completed prior to the completion of the 123<sup>rd</sup> dwelling unit.

- 14. MD 332 and Rollins Avenue: Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances through either private money or full funding in the county's capital program, (b) have been permitted for construction through the operating agency's access permit process, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with the appropriate operating agency:**

- a. Provision of separate northbound left-turn and right-turn approach lanes along Rollins Avenue and any other intersection improvements deemed needed by SHA and /or DPW&T. All these improvements to be constructed according to DPW&T and/or SHA standards.**
- b. Provision of separate westbound through and left-turn approach lanes along**

**MD 332, to be constructed according to SHA standards.**

- c. Submission of an acceptable traffic signal warrant study to SHA and DPW&T for the intersection of MD 332 and Rollins Avenue. The applicant should utilize a new 12-hour count and should analyze signal warrants under total future traffic as well as existing traffic at the direction of SHA. If a signal is deemed warranted by SHA, the applicant shall bond the signal prior to the release of any building permits within the subject property and install it at a time when directed by SHA. The requirement for this signal warrant study may be waived by SHA if that agency determines in writing that there are sufficient recent studies available to make a determination regarding a signal.**

**The improvements in a. above may be waived by SHA and DPW&T in consultation with M NCPPC transportation planning staff only if it is determined by SHA and DPW&T that adequate right-of-way to construct the needed improvements is not available.**

- 15. MD 214 at Addison Road: Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the provision of an eastbound right-turn lane along MD 214 shall (a) have full financial assurances, (b) have been permitted for construction through the operating agency's access permit process, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with the appropriate operating agency.**
- 16. Walker Mill Road at Addison Road: Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances, (b) have been permitted for construction through the operating agency's access permit process, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with the appropriate operating agency:**

**The modification of westbound Walker Mill Road to provide for two exclusive left-turn lanes and an exclusive right-turn lane.**

**Comment:** The above conditions remain valid and are enforceable prior to the issuance of any building permits on Parcel A.

- 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.**

**Comment:** Direct access to the parking garage is not proposed from Zelma Avenue. Access to Addison Road is limited to right-in/right-out.

- 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:** This condition establishes an overall trip generation cap of 163 AM and 226 PM peak-hour vehicle trip caps, and requires a new preliminary plan of subdivision with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities for “any development beyond the 163 AM and 226 PM peak hour trips.” The proposed development shown on the submitted DSP would generate 134 AM and 331 PM peak hour trips, which represents 105 trips above the PM peak-hour trip cap. However, by discounting for the pass-by trips for the retail component 60 percent as recommended by the “Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals” (*Guidelines*), the resulting PM peak hour trips at off-site intersections would be reduced to 213, which is 13 trips less than the PM cap. See Finding 8 and the analysis of Condition 2 of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-08019 for a complete analysis of conformance to the trip cap.

8. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-08019:** Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-08019 was approved by the Planning Board on September 25, 2008 (PGCPB Resolution No. 08-124) for existing Parcel 87, on which the freestanding parking garage is proposed, subject to 5 conditions, which are applicable to the review of this application and warrant discussion as follows:

1. **Development of this site shall be in conformance with the Stormwater Management Concept Plan, No. 24628-2005-01 and any subsequent revisions.**

**Comment:** This condition is discussed above in Finding 7.

2. **Total development within the subject property shall be limited to construction of a parking garage which is projected to generate zero AM and zero PM vehicle trips. The proposed parking facility is to serve the required parking needs (Part 11) for the Commons at Addison Road Development Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (4-05068) only. Any other use of the proposed parking structure or any additional development on this site shall require a new preliminary plan of subdivision with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities. Direct access from Parcel B to Addison Road is denied without the approval of a variation to Section 24-121 of the Subdivision Regulations.**

**Comment:** This condition limits the development on this portion of the property to construction of only a parking garage for any development planned for Parcel A per (4-05068), and establishes an overall trip generation cap of zero AM and zero PM peak-hour vehicle trips. This condition also requires a new preliminary plan of subdivision with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities for “any other use of the proposed parking garage or any additional development on this site.” The proposed development shown on the submitted DSP which is projected to generate 134 AM and 331 PM total peak hour trips, or 132 AM, and 213 PM peak hour resulting offsite vehicle trips, includes 6,550 GSF of retail in addition to the garage parking spaces. The proposed retail on the first floor of the garage would generate two AM, and 78 PM peak hour trips, or one AM, and 31 PM peak hour resulting offsite vehicle trips.

In accordance with the analysis made by the Transportation Planning Section, the overall site development has a trip cap of 163 AM and 226 PM peak-hour vehicle trips. In conjunction with the Transportation Planning Section’s memorandum, the Subdivision Section has included the

table below, which more clearly explains the number of trips associated with different uses on each parcel or lot. After analyzing the data staff believes that total trip generation for the entire site of 132 AM and 226 PM peak-hour vehicle trips does in fact fall below the trip cap.

Uses	Existing Parcel A		Proposed Parcel B		Existing Lot 5	
	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM
Residential (171 du)	51	68	0	0	0	0
Office (37,170 sf)	74	67	0	0	0	0
Library (32,820 sf)	5	5	0	0	0	0
Retail						
	9,340 sf	2 (1)*	112 (45)*	0	0	0
	6,550 sf	0	0	2 (1)*	79 (32)*	0
Pool (4,973 sf)	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>						
<b>TOTAL (Parcel A + Parcel B + Lot 5)</b>	132**	217**				
<b>Preliminary Plan Trip Cap</b>	163	226				

\*Discount of 60% as recommended by the Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals

\*\*Includes the 60% discount for pass-by trips

3. **At the time of final plat the applicant shall dedicate right-of-way (ROW) of 60 feet from the center line of Addison Road.**

**Comment:** The plans correctly demonstrate the proposed dedication.

4. **Prior to approval of the final plat the applicant and the applicants heirs, successors and/or assignees shall obtain approval of a revision to Detailed Site Plan DSP-06001 (PGCPB Resolution No. 06-217) to incorporate Parcel A and the accessory parking garage proposed on Parcel B into one development site.**

**Comment:** This application was filed to address the above condition.

5. **In conformance with the Approved Addison Road Metro Town Center and Vicinity Sector Plan, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide the following:**

- a. **Provide an eight-foot wide sidewalk along the subject site's entire road frontage of Addison Road, unless modified by DPW&T.**

- b. The Approved Addison Road Metro Town Center and Vicinity Sector Plan recommend that Addison Road be designated as a Class III bikeway with appropriate signage. Because Addison Road is a County right-of-way, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide a financial contribution of \$210 to the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) for the placement of this signage. A note shall be placed on the final record plat for payment to be received prior to the issuance of the first building permit.**

**Comment:** An eight-foot-wide sidewalk is shown along the subject site's entire road frontage of Addison Road. Condition 5.b. will be enforced in accordance with the triggers established within that condition.

- 9. **Detailed Site Plan DSP-06001:** Detailed Site Plan DSP-06001 was approved by the Planning Board on September 21, 2006 (PGCPB Resolution No. 06-217) for a mixed-use development to include 170 multifamily units and 22,696 square feet of commercial uses within one, eight-story building. The District Council elected to review the case and affirmed the Planning Board decision with additional conditions on May 15, 2007. The additional conditions required the addition of library and office uses and an increase in the building height up to ten stories. On June 2, 2008, the District Council approved a Revised Condition 4.m., which relates to the undergrounding of utilities. The Final Council Order includes ten conditions of approval, the following of which are applicable to the subject detailed site plan and warrant discussion as follows:

**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.**

**Comment:** Ten parking spaces on the east side of the main building are located partially within the public utility easement (PUE). The three-foot-high screen walls located along Central Avenue are also partially located within the PUE. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, the applicant should provide evidence from all affected utility companies that the encroachments into the PUE are acceptable. If such verification cannot be provided, the plans should be revised to eliminate these encroachments.

**4b. through 4l.**

**Comment:** The subject detailed site plan is in conformance with Conditions 4.b. through 4.l.

- m. The applicant shall place underground all on-site utility lines and facilities, for utilities that serve the subject property and the proposed project. Utility lines and facilities off site need not be underground, but the applicant shall participate in an underground utilities fund at Central Avenue and Addison Road, if one is created, to study or implement the underground placement of utilities in this vicinity. Funding contributions by the applicant shall not exceed \$10,000.**

**Comment:** This condition remains valid and should be carried forward as a condition of approval of this detailed site plan.

**4n. and 4o.**

**Comment:** The subject detailed site plan is in conformance with Conditions 4.n. and 4.o.

- 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.**

**Comment:** The plans show two transformers along the property's Central Avenue frontage, behind the three-foot-high brick wall adjacent to the right-of-way. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, the applicant should provide details demonstrating that the proposed wall will completely screen the transformers from the right-of-way. If it is found that the transformers will not be adequately screened, the plans should be revised to provide additional screening elements.

- 6. Prior to the approval of any building permit, the applicant shall provide evidence of a contribution for the benefit of the Prince George's County Memorial Library System, in the amount of \$57,138, for the development of the library on the subject property.**

**Comment:** This condition remains valid and should be carried forward as a condition of approval of this detailed site plan.

- 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 site'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 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.**

**Comment:** Although an eight-foot-wide sidewalk is shown along the subject site's entire frontage of Central Avenue, it is not separated from the curb by a five-foot-wide grass planting strip as is required by the above condition and the sector plan for a Type B sidewalk. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, the plans should be revised to show a five-foot-wide grass planting strip between the sidewalk and curb along Central Avenue. The plans show an appropriate grass planting strip between the sidewalk and curb along Zelma Avenue.

- 8. Any improvements located within WMATA's right-of-way shall be reviewed and approved by WMATA prior to certificate of approval.**

**Comment:** WMATA indicated that this should be a condition of approval of this detailed site plan since the disturbance of WMATA property is shown on the plans.

- 10. Prior to signature approval, the applicant shall make the following revisions to the plans. (This condition shall be controlling, to the extent that it may be inconsistent with any provision in conditions 1-9.)**

- a. Building height may not exceed 10 stories. The top two floors shall be constructed as two-story condominiums.**

**Comment:** The eastern portion of the building is shown as ten stories, including the penthouse level; however, the western portion of the building is shown as 11 stories, including the penthouse level. Although there is a one-story difference between the two building portions, the building appears to be one consistent height. This is due to the fact that the second through eighth stories have different heights in the two building sections. The result is a building that varies from 142-feet-high (in the 11-story western portion) to 145 feet, four inches-high (in the ten-story eastern portion). Since the ten-story portion of the building is actually taller than the 11-story portion, staff finds that the intent of the above condition has been met; however, a portion of the building is technically 11-stories-high, which is strictly prohibited by the ten-story maximum clearly established by the above condition. The penthouse level of the western portion of the building contains the billiards room/lounge amenity space and the second level of the two-story condominiums required by this condition. This penthouse element also mimics the penthouse element featured on the eastern portion of the building and unifies the overall façade. The reduction in the number of stories within the western portion of the building should not eliminate the penthouse level, if possible. If the penthouse must be eliminated, additional architectural elements should be provided along the roofline of the western portion of the building to provide a visual relationship with the penthouse level within the eastern portion of the building

- b. A fully enclosed swimming pool shall be constructed on the roof.**

**Comment:** As a result of the proposed phasing of the construction of the main building, the applicant is requesting to relocate the enclosed pool from the rooftop of the building to a separate, one-story natatorium proposed south of the main mixed-use building on Lot

- c. The first floor shall be limited to retail uses.**

**Comment:** In order to provide convenient access to the proposed public library, the applicant is requesting to locate the library within the western portion of the first floor and to include retail uses within the eastern portion of the building on the first floor. The remainder of the retail square footage has been relocated to the ground floor of the adjacent parking structure, which will serve to activate the streetscape at this prominent location across from the metro station. Given the public nature of the library use, its location on the first floor is appropriate and will be convenient for pedestrian access.

- d. The second floor shall be limited to library uses.**

**Comment:** Given the fact that the applicant has proposed to locate a portion of the library on the first floor of the building, it is no longer feasible to provide a full second floor for library use. Instead, the applicant proposes to provide a second level of library use within the western portion of the building and office space within the eastern portion of the building on the second floor.

- e. The third floor shall be limited to office uses.**

**Comment:** As a result of the modifications to the proposed uses on the first and second

floors, the applicant is proposing office uses within the eastern portion of the building and residential uses within the western portion of the building on the third floor. The office and residential uses will have separate elevators and lobbies to provide security and separation between the uses.

**f. There shall be one or more security persons on the premises at all times.**

**g. There shall be round-the-clock CCTV camera coverage, at all building entrances and exits.**

**Comment:** These conditions remain valid and have been included on the plans as notes.

**h. All floors above the third floor shall be accessed only by an electronic security card system.**

**Comment:** This condition was included to ensure the security of residents of the building. Given the fact that office uses are now proposed on the third and fourth floors within the eastern portion of the building, the above condition is no longer appropriate; however, all residential portions of the building should be accessed only by an electronic security card system. This condition has been carried over in modified form as a recommended condition of approval of this detailed site plan.

**i. Before 9:00 a.m. and after 8:00 p.m., the building shall be accessed only by an electronic security card system.**

**Comment:** This condition remains valid and has been included on the plans as a note.

**j. A six-foot wrought iron fence shall be constructed around the perimeter of the property.**

**Comment:** A six-foot-high, decorative aluminum fence resembling wrought iron is shown around the perimeter of Parcel A in accordance with this condition. Six-foot-high board-on-board fencing is proposed along the southern property line of Parcel B and Lot 5, between the parking garage and natatorium and the adjacent single-family detached residential properties. While opaque fencing is appropriate in this location to screen the residential properties from the proposed buildings, board-on-board fencing is not in keeping with the high quality architectural design of the project. The proposed fencing should be enhanced and should feature a composite material resembling natural wood with brick piers at all corners and at regular intervals not to exceed 35 feet, or every four eight-foot sections of fence. The fence should be equally attractive from both sides.

**k. There shall be at least 300 parking spaces, provided in a parking structure.**

**Comment:** The applicant is proposing a total of 372 parking spaces, 341 of which will be provided within parking structures.

10. **The requirements of the October 2000 *Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Addison Road Metro Town Center and Vicinity*:** The Community Planning South Division indicated that the application conforms to the land use recommendations of the 2000 Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Addison Road Metro Town Center and Vicinity.



11. **Development District Standards of the Development District Overlay Zone (DDOZ):**  
Overall, the application meets the development district standards of the development district overlay zone associated with the October 2000 *Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Addison Road Metro Town Center and Vicinity*. Where a development district standard cannot be complied with Section 27-548.25(c) of the Zoning Ordinance allows the applicant to request that the Planning Board apply different development standards. 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.

- a. The following amendments were approved with Detailed Site Plan DSP-06001:

#### **List of Uses**

**Comment:** An amendment to the use table to allow dwelling units located above the first floor within a building containing commercial uses, which is four or more stories in height and an outdoor swimming pool was approved by the Planning Board in accordance with Section 27-548.26(b) (1) (B) of the Zoning Ordinance with DSP-06001. The Planning Board approved the applicant's proposed revision to the list of uses to allow an outdoor pool; however, the District Council later required that the rooftop pool be fully enclosed. Although the pool has been relocated from the roof to a separate building on Lot 5, it remains fully enclosed. The District Council affirmed the Planning Board's approval of the revision to the list of uses to allow dwelling units above the first floor within a building containing commercial uses, which is four or more stories in height. Dwelling units are proposed above the first floor within the main building on Parcel A, which contains commercial uses and is more than four stories in height. The previously approved amendment continues to apply to the subject revision.

#### **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.**

**Comment:** An amendment was approved by the Planning Board and District Council with Detailed Site Plan DSP-06001 to allow the width of entrance drives to be a function of the requirements of the authorizing agencies for the permitting of access into the site. The previously approved amendment continues to apply to the subject revision.

#### **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 and institutional uses which front on MD 214 and Addison Road.**

**Comment:** The main mixed-use building fronts on MD 214. The applicant requested the approval of a revised Development District Standard in lieu of the standard set forth above to allow a front build-to line between five and ten feet from the right-of-way. This request was not approved by the Planning Board or District Council because it was found

that the siting of the building between five and ten feet from the right-of-way would be in conflict with the public utility easement. The original building footprint was horseshoe shaped, with the easternmost and westernmost portions meeting the build-to line. Detailed Site Plan DSP-06001 was approved subject to two conditions which impacted the ultimate building design and location. Condition 4.a. required the revision of the plans prior to certification to remove all structures from the public utility easement. As a result, the building, which was shown with a setback from the right-of-way of between five and ten feet, was relocated ten feet behind the right-of-way. Condition 8 required Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA's) approval of all improvements located within their right-of-way prior to certification. The eastern portion of the building was originally located partially within WMATA's right-of-way. During its review of the plans prior to certification, WMATA required that the eastern portion of the building be set back from their right-of-way. As a result, the portion of the building that was proposed to be constructed over the drive aisle accessing the courtyard area was no longer structurally feasible and was removed. The result was the increased setback of the eastern portion of the building. The western portion of the building is set back approximately 13 feet from the right-of-way and meets the front build-to line requirement set forth in S.3C. The proposed parking garage/retail building is set back ten feet from the right-of-way of Addison Road and also meets the requirement.

#### **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.**

**Comment:** An amendment was approved by the Planning Board and District Council with DSP-06001 to allow the partial screening of the loading dock. The previously approved amendment continues to apply to the subject revision.

#### **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.**

**Comment:** An amendment was approved by the Planning Board and District Council

with Detailed Site Plan DSP-06001 to allow a maximum height of 13 feet for freestanding signs and to allow two freestanding signs with a maximum of 100 square feet each for the project. The freestanding signs proposed with this detailed site plan are consistent with DSP-06001 in terms of location, square footage and materials; however, the signs have been redesigned somewhat and now include an arched element. While the design and materials (cast stone) are attractive and appropriate, the overall height of the sign is 18 feet, 4 inches and exceeds the maximum established by the amendment to S.5E. (13 feet) approved with DSP-06001. Prior to signature approval of the detailed site plan, the applicant should revise the freestanding signs so that they are no taller than 13 feet high.

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

**Comment:** An amendment was approved by the Planning Board and District Council with Detailed Site Plan DSP-06001 to allow back-lit letters for the freestanding signage. The sign package included with this detailed site plan revision is in conformance with these revised standards and the certified plans for Detailed Site Plan DSP-06001. The previously approved amendment continues to apply to the subject revision.

**B1. Height, Scale and Massing**

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

**Comment:** An amendment was approved by the Planning Board and District Council with DSP-06001 to allow the partial screening of the loading dock. The previously approved amendment continues to apply to the subject revision.

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

**Comment:** An amendment was approved by the Planning Board to allow the construction of an eight-story building. The District Council modified this approval and indicated in its order of approval that the building may be up to 10 stories. The District Council also included a Condition (10.a.), which requires that the top floor of the building feature two-story condominium units. Conformance to this condition is discussed further in Finding 9. The previously approved amendment continues to apply to the subject revision.

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

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

**Comment:** Amendments were approved by the Planning Board and District Council with DSP-06001 to allow permanent real estate identification signage to be incorporated into the design of the freestanding sign. The previously approved amendment continues to apply to the subject revision.

- b. The following amendments to development district standards have been requested in association with this revision application:

**S4. Buffers and Screening**

- E. The bufferyard requirements within the town center shall be reduced to facilitate a compact form of development compatible with the urban character of the area surrounding the Metro station. The minimum bufferyard requirements for incompatible uses in the Landscape Manual shall be reduced by 50 percent within the town center. Alternative Compliance shall not be required for this reduction. A six-foot-high opaque masonry wall or other opaque screening treatment shall be provided in conjunction with the reduced width of the bufferyard between residential and commercial uses. The plant units required per 100 linear feet of property line or right-of-way shall also be reduced by 50 percent.**

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

**Where feasible, the bufferyard requirements within the town center shall be reduced to facilitate a compact form of development compatible with the urban character of the area surrounding the Metro station. The minimum bufferyard requirements for incompatible uses in the Landscape Manual shall be reduced by 50 percent within the town center. Alternative Compliance shall not be required for this reduction. A six-foot-high opaque masonry wall or other opaque screening treatment shall be provided in conjunction with the reduced width of the bufferyard between residential and commercial uses. The plant units required per 100 linear feet of property line or right-of-way shall also be reduced by 50 percent.**

**Comment:** The applicant has provided the following justification for this request:

“In the instant case, the Applicant is proposing to utilize a combination of plant materials and opaque fencing to minimize the impact of its proposed development on an adjacent residential use. Per the ARM plan, the Applicant is required to provide a ten-foot landscape strip with 40 plant units within the bufferyard. For approximately, 99 linear feet along the property line, this Applicant not only provides the required ten-foot landscape strip, but incorporates 50 plant units, as well as a six-foot-high board-on-board fence to screen the adjacent residential use. With the addition of more plant materials than is required plus fencing, the Applicant contends that the visual impact of the proposed development will be minimized if extra screening near the front and side of the adjacent residential use is provided. In the area closest to the rear yard of the adjacent residential use, however, the Applicant is proposing a six-foot-high board-on-board fence for approximately 48 linear feet. Although the ten-foot landscape strips, with plant materials are not being provided along 48 linear feet of area, which abuts the rear yard of the adjacent residential use, the Applicant is providing sight-tight fencing. The Applicant maintains that extending its patio area to the property line, for only 48 linear feet, would afford the residents of its development with more usable space, while at the same time minimize the impact to adjacent residential by the provision of enhance screening along the property line for 99 linear feet of area. Lastly, this alternate design

being proposed by the Applicant will not substantially impair implementation of the master plan, master plan amendment or sector plan, since the sector plan specifically calls for a compact form of development compatible with the urban character of the area surrounding the metro station.”

**Comment:** Staff does not support the applicant’s request to eliminate a portion of the required bufferyard between the natatorium and the adjacent single-family detached residential use so that the proposed patio between the natatorium and parking garage can be extended. A buffer, as defined by the *Prince George’s County Landscape Manual*, consists of “a combination of physical space and vertical elements, such as plants, berms, fences, or walls, the purpose of which is to separate and screen incompatible land uses from each other.” While the applicant’s proposal partially provides for the vertical elements required (a six-foot-high fence is proposed), it lacks the physical space element that is provided by a landscape yard. Staff recognizes that the goals of the sector plan are to promote transit-oriented, pedestrian-oriented, compact redevelopment in the town center; however, the provision of the required bufferyard along the southern property between the natatorium and the adjacent residential development will not impede these goals. The sector plan has already allowed for a 50 percent reduction in the bufferyard that would be required in this location per the *Prince George’s County Landscape Manual*. Staff finds that it would be inappropriate to reduce the bufferyard further in this location and is recommending that the full bufferyard required by S4. E be required along the southern property line.

**H. Bufferyards shall be provided between existing residential homes within Metro West and the proposed retail/commercial development.**

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

**Bufferyards shall be provided between existing residential homes within Metro West and the proposed retail/commercial development unless the existing residential use can be adequately screened with a combination of planting materials and opaque fencing.**

**Comment:** The applicant has provided the following justification for this request:

“As noted above, per the ARM plan, the applicant is required to provide a ten-foot landscape strip with 40 plant units within the bufferyard to screen the adjacent residential development. For approximately, 99 linear feet along the property line, this Applicant not only provides the required ten-foot landscape strip, but incorporates 50 plant units, as well as a six-foot-high board-on-board fence to screen the adjacent residential use. With the addition of more plant materials than is required plus fencing, the applicant contends that the visual impact of the proposed development will be minimized if extra screening near the front and side of the adjacent residential use is provided. In the area closest to the rear yard of the adjacent residential use, however, the applicant is proposing a six-foot-high board-on-board fence for approximately 48 linear feet. Although the ten-foot landscape strips, with plant materials are not being provided along 48 linear feet of area, which abuts the rear yard of the adjacent residential use, the Applicant is providing sight-tight fencing. The applicant maintains that extending its patio area to the property line, for only 48 linear feet, would afford the

residents of its development with more usable space, while at the same time minimize the impact to adjacent residential by the provision of enhance screening along the property line for 99 linear feet of area. 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.”

**Comment:** As noted above, staff finds that the applicant’s request is unnecessary and inappropriate given the nature of the proposed and adjacent uses and is recommending that the full bufferyard required along the southern property line be provided.

### **B3      Materials and Architectural Details**

#### **G.      Imitation or synthetic exterior building materials which simulate the appearance of stone or brick should be avoided.**

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

**Imitation or synthetic exterior building materials which simulate the appearance of stone or brick should be avoided unless incorporated within a mixed-use development in which case such materials may be used as architectural accents.**

**Comment:** The applicant has provided the following justification for this request:

“As part of the proposed building design, the applicant will be utilizing natural materials predominately throughout the building. GFRP (Glass/Fiber/Reinforced/Plaster) cornice material, however, will be incorporated as architectural accents on the upper floors of the building. The GFRP cornice material is being used to improve the overall aesthetics of the proposed building, as it is better able to be design to complement the building’s architecture. Moreover, the GFRP cornice material replaces the exterior insulation finishing system (EIFS) cornice, which is generally less expensive, and was previously approved by Detailed Site Plan DSP-060001.”

**Comment:** Staff finds that the applicant’s proposal is appropriate. A sample of the GFRP material was provided to staff for examination and was found to be attractive and of seemingly high quality and durability. The proposed cornices are located some distance above the pedestrian level where the material will read as cast stone.

The applicant’s request for an amendment from this standard does not consider the large area of EIFS proposed on the east elevation of the building in Phase 1. Although the exposure of this material will be temporary, it is not in conformance with the above standard. High quality, durable materials are recommended by the Sector Plan for use on all building facades. Based upon current market conditions, it is not possible to forecast with any assurance how much time will elapse between the completion of Phases 1 and 2. Therefore, an attractive, durable material, such as masonry-based panels should be incorporated into the design of the temporary portion of the east façade.

#### **B4. Window and Door Openings**

- A. Individual “punched” or framed windows are recommended instead of horizontal “ribbon or band” type windows. Curtain walls and other continuous floor-to-ceiling windows shall be avoided.**

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

**When part of a mixed-use development, individual “punched” or framed windows are recommended instead of horizontal “ribbon or band” type windows. Curtain walls and other continuous floor-to-ceiling windows shall be avoided where feasible.**

**Comment:** The applicant has provided the following justification for this request:

“As the Applicant is developing a mixed-use building, which includes residential/commercial/retail/quasi-governmental uses in various areas of the building, it is necessary to visually enhance the scale of the building. As designed, the Applicant is proposing that punched windows be used predominately throughout the proposed building. Curtain walls, however, will be used between the first and second floors to enhance the scale proportions of the building and to create a more lively retail environment. Large windows are being proposed at the corners and central entry areas to break up the mass of the proposed building. Continuous glass storefront will also be incorporated at the natatorium to create a more natural outdoor “feel” by increasing the natural daylight when inside the facility. 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.”

**Comment:** Staff finds that the applicant’s proposal is appropriate given the nature of the retail and natatorium uses proposed and recommends approval of the applicant’s proposed modified Development District Standard.

- c. Although an appropriate amendment was not requested, the plans are not in conformance with the following development district standards:

#### **S4. Buffers and Screening**

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

**Comment:** The plans are not in conformance with Section 4.1 of the *Prince George’s County Landscape Manual*, which requires a minimum of one shade tree per 1,600 square feet of green area provided. This section of the Landscape Manual does not allow for the substitution of shade trees with shrubs, ornamental or evergreen trees as the schedule on the plans indicates. Prior to signature approval, the plans should be revised to demonstrate conformance to this section of the Landscape Manual. The approved plans for Detailed Site Plan DSP-06001 show shade trees on the east side of the building in association with the plaza proximate to the retail space. These trees should be

reincorporated into the design to provide shade for users of this space.

## **S2. Parking Areas**

- D. Parking lots/spaces which are located adjacent to the right-of-way line or curb edge due to site constraints shall be screened from adjacent roadways and public areas with a continuous, low masonry wall in compliance with the Parking Lot Landscape Strip, Option 4 requirements in the Landscape Manual. A four-foot-wide landscape strip shall be provided between the right-of-way line and the parking lot. The wall should be between 36 to 42 inches in height and be faced on both sides with a masonry veneer. A masonry veneer may be constructed of brick, stone, precast concrete panels, split-face concrete masonry units or an equivalent material. Unfinished concrete block or poured-in place concrete are not acceptable materials. The low masonry wall shall be compatible in materials and design with nearby buildings. One shade tree per 35 linear feet of frontage, excluding driveway openings shall also be provided. Shrubs may be planted in front of the wall and between the shade trees to form a solid hedge within two growing seasons. Shrubs shall be installed at a minimum of 18 inches in height and 30 inches on center. Parking lots utilizing berms should be avoided.**

**Comment:** The plans provide 36-inch-high, brick-faced walls between the surface parking facility and the street in accordance with the above requirement. The plans do not, however, provide the required plant material along Central Avenue. The plans should be revised prior to signature approval to demonstrate conformance with the above standard where the parking lot is adjacent to Central Avenue.

## **B4. Window and Door Openings**

- D. Large, blank building walls are not permitted when facing public areas such as streets, parking lots or zones of pedestrian activity.**

**Comment:** The temporary east elevation proposed with Phase 1 of the main mixed-use building features only one column of windows within a large expanse of otherwise unadorned façade. Although the exposure of this portion of the building is intended to be temporary, it is not in conformance with the above standard. Based upon current market conditions, it is not possible to forecast with any assurance how much time will elapse between the completion of Phases 1 and 2. Therefore, this portion of the façade may be exposed for some time. As such, it should be enhanced to include additional window openings. Specifically, staff is recommending that two additional vertical columns of windows be provided on the temporary portion of the east façade. The windows should be organized in a balanced and rhythmic composition, the design of which should be reviewed and approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board prior to signature approval of the detailed site plan.

12. **Requirements of the Zoning Ordinance:** The application has been reviewed for conformance to the C-S-C and R-55 Zones 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.**

- a. **In the C-S-C 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.
  - b. **In the R-55 Zone:** The plan was reviewed for conformance to the requirements of the R-55 Zone regulations and was found to be in conformance with them. The proposed natatorium has been defined as a homes association recreational use, which is a permitted use in the R-55 Zone.
13. ***Prince George's County Landscape Manual:*** The proposed development is subject to the requirements of Sections 4.1, Residential Requirements, 4.2, Commercial and Industrial Landscaped Strip Requirements, 4.3, Parking Lot Requirements, and 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, of the Landscape Manual. Conformance to Sections 4.1, 4.3(a), and 4.7 (as modified by the Sector Plan) is discussed above in Finding 11. With respect to Section 4.2 of the Landscape Manual, the plans indicate that the number of shade trees required can be substituted with an equivalent number of ornamental or evergreen trees. Per Section 4.2(a)(4) of the Landscape Manual, such substitutions may be applied when the plantings normally required "would result in an inappropriate or impractical design due to underground utilities, overhead wires, or other factors." The applicant has not provided evidence, nor is it apparent based on review of the plans, why the substitution of plant material is warranted. Such evidence should be furnished to the Urban Design Section for review and approval prior to certification of the detailed site plan, in order to determine whether or not substitutions are appropriate. If substitutions are found to be appropriate, the substitution rates established within Section 4.2(a)(4) should apply.
14. **Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance:** This property is not subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation 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 and the Countywide Planning Division, issued a Standard Letter of Exemption from the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance on January 15, 2010.
15. **Referral Comments:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:

**Community Planning**—The Community Planning South Division indicated that this application is consistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies for the Developed Tier and that the development application conforms to the land use recommendations of the 2000 Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Addison Road Metro Town Center & Vicinity for Subarea 4-Addison Road South. The Community Planner pointed out that the General Plan is a guideline that provides target numbers for development intensity in the entire center, page 49. Table 3 on page 49 breaks the community center into the Core and Edge areas. Those areas are defined as: The Core, in most cases, should include the area that is between one-quarter to one-third mile walking distant from a transit station or stop. The edge of a Center will generally be located an additional one-quarter to one-third mile walking distance beyond the primary core.

The subject property is located in a designated Community Center and Developed Tier. The vision for Centers is mixed-residential and non-residential uses at moderate to high densities and intensities, with 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 vision for the Metro West (Town Commons) described on page 90 plans for a mix of uses to include retail/commercial, office, single-family attached residential, institutional and a public town square. A vertical mix of uses is encouraged. Along the main street of the town commons, Addison Road and MD 214 office and/or residential uses are desired above ground floor retail uses. Outdoor dining areas associated with restaurants are strongly encouraged to animate the street environment. Residential development is anticipated to support the uses in the town commons area with convenient access to the Metro Station. The (DDS-2) Town Center Detailed land use map on page 168 implements this vision and delineates the location for mixed-use retail and office use.

The Addison Road Town Center is also identified as a Center in the Approved Subregion 4 Master Plan and Endorsed Sectional Map Amendment area. A second public hearing is scheduled on Tuesday, March 30, 2010. This plan has not been adopted. The Subregion 4 Plan vision supports a medium-high density residential land use, with one of its premier residential goals to establish a more dense land use development pattern for previously developed residential areas, with suburban densities and designs, within close proximity (one mile) of a center.

This application proposes to revise the detailed site plan with the addition of a one-story swimming pool building and a four-story garage. Future plan submissions must include detail information regarding design elements that are in conformance with the Development District Standards as outlined on pages 173-231 of the 2000 Approved Sector Plan & Sectional Map Amendment for the Addison Road Metro Town Center and Vicinity.

The proposed free standing sign located at the front entrance of the North Building on Central Avenue exceeds the 13 foot height approved by the Planning Board in a previous amendment to the development plan. Also, the applicant indicates in the Statement of Justification for an amendment to the development plan certain standards that are not being met for buffers and screening areas, materials and architectural details, and windows and door openings. These items are discussed in detail in Finding 11.

**Transportation Planning Section**—The Transportation Planning Section provided an analysis of the detailed site plan’s conformance to previously approved conditions of approval and determined that this plan is acceptable and meets the finding required for a DSP as described in Section 27-285 of the Zoning Ordinance, if the applicant can satisfactorily address approval conditions 4.n. and 18 of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-05068 and Condition 1 of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-08019.

Condition 4.n. was addressed through a revision to the plans. The plans show the location of a “No Thru Trucks” sign, which will restrict access to the property from Zelma Avenue.

Conformance to Condition 18 of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-05068 and Condition 1 of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-08019 are discussed in Findings 7 and 8 above.

**Subdivision Section**—The Subdivision Section provided an analysis of the detailed site plan’s conformance to Condition 18 of 4-05068 and Condition 2 of 4-08019, which relate to the trip

caps for the property and are discussed in Findings 7 and 8. The Subdivision Section also provided the following comments regarding the need for a new preliminary plan of subdivision and final plats:

A final plat of subdivision should be filed by the applicant to include Parcel A and Parcel B (Parcel 87). It is staff's belief that a plat of consolidation would provide the best avenue for all parties to mutually agree to the eventual execution of the development plan.

The proposed pool house building (4,973 gross square feet) located on Lot 5, Block B (Plat 16@61), was not subject to the previous two preliminary plans of subdivision (4-05068 & 4-08019). Staff would note that because of the building's size a preliminary plan of subdivision is not required pursuant to Section 24-111(c)(2) of the Subdivision Regulations:

**(c) A final plat of subdivision approved prior to October 27, 1970, shall be resubdivided prior to the issuance of a building permit unless:**

**(2) The total development proposed for the final plat does not exceed five thousand (5,000) square feet of gross floor area.**

The applicant should note that the trigger for the requirement of a preliminary plan of subdivision, of no more than 5,000 square feet, is a cumulative total. The addition of 27 square feet of gross floor area ( $4,973 + 28 = 5,001$  square feet) in the future would require a preliminary plan of subdivision. The detailed site plan should include a general note which states the following:

"Pursuant to Section 24-111(c)(2) the current development proposed does not exceed 5,000 square feet of gross floor area. Any additional gross floor area which would result in a total GFA for this site of more than 5,000 square feet will require a preliminary plan of subdivision."

Additionally, to ensure that the exemption will apply to the future development of the site, the applicant should file a final plat for the area of Lot 5 in accordance with Section 24-108 of the Subdivision Regulations for which no preliminary plan is required. The final plat should include a note to ensure the exemption under Sec. 24-111(c)(2) as described above.

The Subdivision Section's recommendations have been included as recommended conditions of this detailed site plan.

**Trails**—The Transportation Planning Section's trails planner provided a detailed analysis of the application's conformance to the recommendations of the applicable sector plans and previous approvals. The trails planner indicated that the submitted plans meet the intent of the previous conditions of approval, several of which are recommended to be carried forward as conditions of approval of this detailed site plan. The trails planner also made several recommendations relating to connectivity from the site to the adjacent sidewalk network including requirements for additional crosswalks as follows:

Some members of the community have expressed an interest in a more direct pedestrian route from the Addison Road Metro to the subject site. More specifically, many of the pedestrians going from Metro to the subject property will be crossing Addison Road at Central Avenue (MD 214). Discussions have focused on either providing a more direct pedestrian connection from the intersection of Addison Road and MD 214 to the building entrance or locating the buildings closer to the street edge.

A more direct pedestrian route is feasible if a pedestrian walkway or sidewalk is provided as part of an enhanced bio-retention pond. The pond should be designed as an attractive amenity as it will be visible from both MD 214 and Addison Road and a trail or pedestrian path should be provided as part of this feature. An additional access point is also necessary along the gate, similar to the access point already proposed along Zelma Avenue. In order to provide a direct pedestrian route, staff recommends that an eight-foot-wide walkway or sidewalk be incorporated into an improved stormwater management pond amenity and that one additional access point be provided through the perimeter gate (see recommended location marked in red on the attached plan). If security is a concern regarding this additional access point, the path could be gated with access restricted during some hours or be card access only.

A crosswalk is also recommended across MD 332 in order to connect the existing sidewalk along MD 214 (north of MD 332) to the sidewalk along MD 214 at the Zelma Avenue intersection (south and east of MD 332). This crosswalk may either cross MD 332 once and directly link to the existing sidewalks along MD 214; or crosswalks may be provided across MD 332 and Zelma Avenue (see recommended locations marked in red on attached aerial).

The trails planner's recommendations have been included as recommended conditions of approval of this detailed site plan.

**Permit Review Section**—The Permit Review Section offered several comments with respect to Detailed Site Plan DSP-06001-01. The comments have been addressed by revisions to the plans or in the recommended conditions below.

**Environmental Planning Section**—The Environmental Planning Section provided a detailed analysis of the plan's conformance to conditions of previous approvals and the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance, which are discussed above in Findings 7 and 13.

**Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department**—At the time of the writing of this technical staff report, comments have not been received from the Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department.

**Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T)**—At the time of the writing of this technical staff report, comments have not been received from DPW&T. Prior to signature approval of the detailed site plan, evidence that the detailed site plan is consistent with the approved stormwater management concept plan should be submitted.

**Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA)**—WMATA indicated that any disturbance to WMATA-owned land would require approval prior to signature of the detailed site plan, which will include the requirement for a formal submittal of the site plan with major equipment locations, notes, cuts of the surface work at the bioretention pond and the new right-turn lane from eastbound Central Avenue onto southbound Addison Road. A condition has been included in the Recommendation Section, which would require the approval of any proposed disturbance to WMATA right-of-way, prior to signature approval of the detailed site plan.

**Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA)**—SHA indicated that their review comments have been addressed through revisions to the plans and that all conditions included with the approval of the preliminary plans to improve SHA roadways remain valid. These conditions will be enforced at the time of permit

**Public Utilities**—At the time of the writing of this technical staff report, comments have not been received from Potomac Electric Power Company (PEPCO) or Verizon.

**Towns of Seat Pleasant, Capitol Heights and Fairmont Heights**—At the time of the writing of this technical staff report, staff has not received comment from these municipalities.

17. 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.

## RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the foregoing evaluation and analysis, if the Planning Board approves the subject Detailed Site Plan revision DSP-06001-01, Commons at Addison Road, the Urban Design staff recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and recommends APPROVAL of the application as follows:

- A. Staff recommends APPROVAL of the following additional amendments to the development district standards set forth in the October 2000 *Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Addison Road Metro Town Center and Vicinity*:
  1. B3. Materials and Architectural Details, Standard G: to allow GFRP (Glass/Fiber/Reinforced/Plaster) cornice material to be used on the buildings.
  2. B4. Window and Door Openings, Standard A: to allow glass curtain walls associated with the retail within the main building and the natatorium building.
- B. Staff recommends APPROVAL of Detailed Site Plan DSP-06001-01, Commons at Addison Road, Icon Property, subject to the following conditions:
  1. Prior to certificate approval of this detailed site plan, the applicant shall:
    - a. Provide evidence from all affected utility companies that the encroachments into the public utility easements (PUE) shown on the plans are acceptable. If such verification cannot be provided, these encroachments shall be eliminated from the plans.
    - b. Provide details demonstrating that the proposed wall will completely screen the transformers from the right-of-way. If it is found that the transformers will not be adequately screened, the plans shall be revised to provide additional screening elements.
    - c. Revise the plans to replace the board-on-board fencing proposed along the southern property line with an enhanced fence featuring a composite material resembling natural wood with brick piers at all corners and at regular intervals not to exceed 35 feet, or every four eight-foot-sections of fence. The fence shall be equally attractive from both sides and shall be reviewed and approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.

- d. Revise the plans to demonstrate conformance to Section 4.1 of *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*.
- e. Revise the plans to reincorporate shade trees into the design of the plaza associated with the retail on the east side of the main building.
- f. Provide evidence from Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) that the detailed site plan is consistent with the approved stormwater management concept plan.
- g. Revise the plans to demonstrate conformance with S4. E. along the south property line adjacent to the existing single-family detached residence.
- h. Revise the plans to provide a five-foot-wide grass planting strip between the sidewalk and curb along Central Avenue.
- i. Revise the plans to provide loading spaces that are 33 feet long by 12 feet wide.
- j. Provide a loading schedule on the site plan.
- k. Provide a gate in the perimeter fence where the sidewalk or pedestrian path intersects with the sidewalk along Central Avenue (MD 214).
- l. Provide Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-compliant curb cuts and ramps and a marked crosswalk where the trail intersects with the drive aisle.
- m. Provide ADA-compliant curb cuts and ramps and a marked crosswalk across MD 332 in the vicinity of the Zelma Avenue intersection, unless modified by SHA.
- n. Provide an eight-foot-wide sidewalk or path around the bioretention pond. This sidewalk or path will provide pedestrian access from Central Avenue (MD 214) (near the intersection with Addison Road) to the internal drive aisle and sidewalk leading to the building entrance.
- o. Add the following note on the site plan:

“Pursuant to Section 24-111(c)(2) the current development proposed does not exceed 5,000 square feet of gross floor area. Any additional gross floor area which would result in a total GFA for this site of more than 5,000 square feet will require a preliminary plan of subdivision.”
- p. Revise the plans to demonstrate conformance to Section 4.2 of the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*. If the substitution of plant material is proposed pursuant to Section 4.2(a)(4) of the Landscape Manual, justification of the need for such substitution shall be submitted to the Urban Design Section for review as designee of the Planning Board.
- q. Revise the plans to demonstrate conformance to S4.D of the Sector Plan where the parking lot is adjacent to Central Avenue.

- r. Revise the east elevation (Phase 1) to replace the EIFS with a high quality, durable, and attractive finish material, such as masonry-based panels, to be reviewed and approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.
  - s. Revise the temporary portion of the east elevation (Phase 1) to provide two additional vertical columns of windows. The windows shall be organized in a balanced and rhythmic composition, the design of which shall be reviewed and approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.
  - t. Revise the freestanding signs so that they are no taller than 13 feet high.
  - u. Revise the Proposed Development table on the cover sheet so that it reflects the phasing demonstrated in the parking tabulation.
  - v. Revise the parking tabulation to accurately account for the required parking for the multifamily units.
  - w. Provide evidence that the proposed disturbances to WMATA-owned land have been approved by WMATA.
  - x. Revise the elevations so that the western portion of the building is no more than ten stories.
2. A final plat that consolidates the entirety of the land areas that comprise preliminary plans 4-05068 and 4-08019 shall be approved. The plat shall be filed in accordance with Preliminary Plan 4-08019 and incorporate Parcel A from Preliminary Plan 4-05068 in accordance with Section 24-108 of the Subdivision Regulations.
  3. A final plat for Lot 5 of Block B shall be approved with the following note:  
  
 “Development on Lot 5 of Block B is limited to a cumulative 5,000 square feet of gross floor area pursuant to Section 24-111(c). At such time that development should exceed this maximum, then a preliminary plan of subdivision shall be required.”
  4. The following notes shall be placed on the final plat for the area that comprises preliminary plans 4-05068 and 4-08019, prior to approval:  
  
 “This plat consists of the all the land area approved under preliminary plan 4-05068 and 4-08019 respectively.”  
  
 “The development of the underlying Parcel A and proposed Parcel B shall be in conformance with preliminary plans 4-05068 and 4-08019 respectively.”
  5. The application for the building permit for Parcel A shall contain a certification, to be submitted to The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC), prepared by a professional engineer with competency in acoustical analysis using the certification template. The certification shall state that the interior noise levels have been reduced through the proposed building materials to 45 dBA Ldn or less.
  6. Prior to the approval of any building permit, the applicant shall provide evidence of a

contribution for the benefit of the Prince George's County Memorial Library System, in the amount of \$57,138, for the development of the library on the subject property.

7. The applicant shall place underground all on-site utility lines and facilities, for utilities that serve the subject property and the proposed project. Utility lines and facilities off site need not be underground, but the applicant shall participate in an underground utilities fund at Central Avenue (MD 214) and Addison Road, if one is created, to study or implement the underground placement of utilities in this vicinity. Funding contributions by the applicant shall not exceed \$10,000.
8. All residential portions of the building shall be accessed only by an electronic security card system.
9. Construct the eight-foot-wide sidewalk along the subject's entire frontage of Central Avenue (MD 214), unless modified by SHA. This sidewalk shall be separated from the curb by a five-foot-wide grass planting strip.
10. Construct the eight-foot-wide sidewalk along the subject site's entire road frontage of Addison Road, unless modified by DPW&T.
11. Construct the five-foot-wide sidewalk along the subject site's entire frontage of Zelma Avenue, unless modified by DPW&T. This sidewalk shall be separated from the curb by a five-foot-wide grass planting strip.
12. The applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors and/or assignees shall submit three original Recreational Facilities Agreements (RFA) to DRD for construction of private recreational facilities, for approval prior to the submission of final plats. Upon approval by DRD, the RFA shall be recorded among the county Land Records.
13. The fitness center, aerobics room, business center, media center, lounge/billiards room, and indoor pool building (natatorium) shall be completed prior to the completion of the 123<sup>rd</sup> dwelling unit.
14. Conditions 4.m., 5, 6, 10.a., 10.f., 10.g., 10.i., 10.j., and 10.k. of the District Council's Order of Approval for Detailed Site Plan DSP-06001 remain valid and are applicable to the subject application.