The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission
Prince George's County Planning Department
Development Review Division
301-952-3530

Note: *Staff reports can be accessed at www.mncppc.org/pgco/planning/plan.htm.*

Detailed Site Plan DSP-10028

Application	**General Data**	
Project Name: Maryland Book Exchange **Location:** The east side of Baltimore Avenue (US 1), north of College Avenue and west of Yale Avenue, within the City of College Park. **Applicant/Address:** R & J Company, LLC c/o Josef Mittleman PO Box 522 Locust Valley, NY 11560	Planning Board Hearing Date:	01/19/12
	Staff Report Date:	01/12/12
	Date Accepted:	07/14/11
	Planning Board Action Limit:	Waived
	Plan Acreage:	2.71
	Zone:	M-U-I/D-D-O
	Dwelling Units:	313
	Gross Floor Area:	499,188 sq. ft.
	Planning Area:	66
	Tier:	Developed
	Council District:	03
	Election District	21
	Municipality:	College Park
	200-Scale Base Map:	209NE04

Purpose of Application	**Notice Dates**	
This case was continued from the Planning Board agenda date of December 8, 2011 to January 19, 2012. The redevelopment of the Maryland Book Exchange site with a single mixed-use building consisting of 313 multifamily residential units and 14,366 square feet of retail space.	Informational Mailing:	09/07/10
	Acceptance Mailing:	07/11/11
	Sign Posting Deadline:	10/04/11

Staff Recommendation			**Staff Reviewer:** Jill Kosack **Phone Number:** 301-952-4689 **E-mail:** Jill.Kosack@ppd.mncppc.org
APPROVAL	**APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS**	**DISAPPROVAL**	**DISCUSSION**
	X		

January 12, 2012

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Prince George's County Planning Board

VIA: Steve Adams, Urban Design Supervisor, Development Review Division

FROM: Jill Kosack, Senior Planner, Urban Design Section, Development Review Division

SUBJECT: Detailed Site Plan DSP-10028
Maryland Book Exchange

The Urban Design staff has reviewed revised architectural elevations submitted for the detailed site plan for the subject property and presents the following revised evaluation and findings leading to a recommendation of APPROVAL, with the conditions listed in the revised Recommendation section of this memorandum. The findings and conditions below include only those from the original staff report, dated November 23, 2011, to which revisions are proposed. New language to be added is **bold and underlined** and old language to be removed is *[bracketed and in italics]*.

REVISED FINDINGS

Based upon the analysis of the revised architecture, the Urban Design staff recommends the following revised findings:

1. **Request:** The detailed site plan is for the redevelopment of the Maryland Book Exchange site, currently occupied by a single-story structure, with a single **four- to** six-story mixed-use building consisting of **313** *[341]* multifamily residential units and 14,366 square feet of retail space.

4. **Development Data Summary:**

	EXISTING	**PROPOSED**
Zone(s)	M-U-I/ D-D-O-Z	M-U-I/D-D-O-Z
Use(s)	Commercial	Multifamily Residential/ Commercial/Retail
Acreage	2.71	2.71
Lots	10	10
Square Footage/GFA	32,480	**499,188** *[398,693]*
Multifamily Dwelling Units:	0	**313** *[341]*

OTHER DEVELOPMENT DATA

Bedroom Unit Mix—Multifamily

Unit Type	Number of Units	Proposed	Average Square Footage
Studio	**66** *[68]*	**21.0** *[20.0]*	364
1 Bedroom	**8** *[10]*	**2.6** *[3.0]*	450
2 Bedrooms	**42** *[60]*	**13.4** *[17.5]*	727
4 Bedrooms	**197** *[203]*	**63.0** *[59.5]*	1,209
Total	**313** *[341]*	100	

***Note:** Per the Sector Plan, page 246, "Bedroom percentages for multifamily dwellings as specified in Section 27-419 of the Zoning Ordinance shall not apply within the Central US 1 Corridor development district."

Parking Requirements per the Sector Plan*

Uses	Spaces
Residential Use (**313** *[341]* units @ 1 space per dwelling unit)	**313** *[341]*
Retail Use (14,366 sq. ft. @ 3 spaces per 1,000 sq. ft.)	43
Sub-Total	**356** *[384]*
Shared Parking Factor for Retail and Residential = 1.2	
Total Parking Required = **356** *[384]* spaces / 1.2	**297** *[320]*
Total Parking Provided	**297** *[320]***** (99** *[104]* **compact; 4 handicapped; 4 van-accessible handicapped)**

***Note:** Mixed-use developments may use the shared parking factor to determine a reduction in the required number of parking spaces.

****Note:** For **297** *[320]* required spaces, a maximum of **98** *[106]* spaces may be compact and 8 handicapped spaces are required. The provided parking **does not** meet*[s]* these requirements **as 99 compact spaces are proposed and** *[; however,]* all of the provided handicapped spaces are less than the required 19 feet in length and one does not have the required adjacent striped access aisle. These issues **have been included as conditions of this approval** *[would have to be corrected prior to any approval of this DSP]* because handicap spaces must be designed to meet the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

6. **Design Features:** The subject property is roughly rectangular in shape and is surrounded on three sides by public rights-of-way, US 1 to the west, College Avenue to the south, and Yale Avenue to the east, and adjacent to the north is the University of Maryland campus. The DSP proposes to develop the property with one **four- to** six-story, approximately 86-foot-high, mixed-use, retail and residential building that includes two levels of parking, one below grade and one as part of the ground level of the building. The proposed building is located with a full building frontage provided within ten feet of the US 1 right-of-way for approximately 142 feet, within 12 feet of the College Avenue right-of-way for approximately 388 feet, and within ten feet of the Yale Avenue right-of-way for approximately 272 feet. The building is set back approximately 15 to 20 feet from the northern property line, which allows room for a landscaped strip and a walkway providing access to the interior bicycle parking area. The remainder of the site area includes ten- to 20-foot-wide concrete sidewalks, with brick borders, and street trees in a green strip and with grates along all road frontages, along with other planting areas. Benches, bike racks and

pedestrian-scaled lighting rounds out the list of provided pedestrian amenities. The site design uses an underground stormwater vault, located under the northwest corner of the building, as the treatment facility for stormwater management.

The building floor plan includes one below-grade parking level with **153** *[176]* parking spaces. The ground floor level includes the entire 14,366 gross square feet of retail space, which is located along the US 1 and westernmost College Avenue frontages, with separate entrances for four different tenant spaces, which will include a relocated Maryland Book Exchange store. Behind the retail area is an at-grade interior courtyard, finished with concrete and artificial turf, which has entrances to the retail spaces and connects to a parking area. The parking area includes 144 car parking spaces and 280 bicycle parking spaces and fills the northeast corner of the building footprint. Staff has several concerns about this interior courtyard layout. First, the applicant does not guarantee that the retail space tenants will allow the public to use the rear access doors off of the courtyard; therefore, any public retail customer parking in the garage would have to exit onto Yale Avenue, walk south and then walk west along College Avenue to access the retail tenants. Therefore, **as a condition of this approval** *[with any future approval of this DSP]*, staff *[would]* recommend**s** that a more direct public access be provided from the covered parking area to the retail spaces. Secondly, if the retail space tenants do not allow public access through their doors facing this courtyard, staff is concerned about the intended use and safety of such a space. Without appropriate lighting, surveillance, maintenance and consistent use, this courtyard space could become ill-maintained, unsafe, and a detriment to the overall building. Therefore, **a condition of this approval includes requirements to** *[any future approval of this DSP should]* clarify and provide responses to these issues.

Besides one interior loading space accessed from College Avenue via a metal roll-up door, the remainder of the ground-level building frontage along College Avenue is used for the residential lobbies and associated office, mail, and amenity spaces. The access to the loading space off of College Avenue conflicts with the location of existing on-street parallel parking; **a condition has been included requiring clarification of** *[any future approval of this DSP should clarify]* what is to happen to these spaces. The Yale Avenue building frontage at ground level consists of the enclosed parking area and separate metal roll-up doors providing access to parking, a loading space and a separate, combined loading and trash area. The first floor of the building consists of residential units, some amenity spaces, along with two internal, outdoor, artificial turf courtyards with a small section of permeable paving for resident use. Staff is concerned about the design of these two courtyards, the planned uses, and maintenance and safety measures, especially considering the lack of any vertical or horizontal separation between the courtyard and the surrounding residential unit windows. Without some clear focus of use, safety lighting, access limits and separation from apartments, these courtyards could possibly become areas for activities that are disruptive to other residents. The top four floors of the building contain the remainder of the residential units. No site circulation plan, including vehicular and pedestrian movements, was provided as required by the Sector Plan; therefore, **a condition has been included requiring** *[any future approval of this DSP should require]* the submission of such a plan.

The mostly flat-roofed, six-story **portion of the** building will be faced with a mix of red brick veneer in running bond and Flemish bond patterns; precast stone trim, including bands above the first and second stories and at the base; Hardie panel wall system in various shades of cream and gray; and gray metal paneling, along with aluminum storefront windows. Brick and masonry predominate on the lower four floors on all sides of the building, except along the northern elevation where the brick only covers the first and part of the second floor. The Hardie panel system covers the majority of the **fifth and sixth stories of the building** *[upper floors of the building on all four sides]*. The metal paneling covers the entire upper five floors on **the western**

corners of the building *[each corner]* and on articulated window bays that are evenly spaced on **the southern, western, and northern sides** *[all four sides]* of the building. The applicant intends to obtain at least a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Silver Certification, using the LEED for Homes Checklist as submitted with the proposed building and site design. *[Generally, staff finds the building design on all elevations to be generic, monotonous, and unimaginative. The proposed building is a massive, six-story, block-filling building that will be highly visible from the adjacent university campus and the historic district, due to its height in relation to surrounding structures. Extra attention should have been given to the architectural composition in order to mitigate the massing and volume of the building. More innovative articulation of forms and detailed architectural design on the entire building should be required with any future approval of this DSP.]*

The revised eastern end of the building, which extends for a small portion of the southern and northern elevations, is now four stories high with a two-story-high shingled, sloped roof. The ground floor level has tall paned-windows with half-rounds on top and is faced entirely with precast stone. The upper three stories are faced in red brick veneer, in the same mix of running bond and Flemish bond patterns, and has square, paned, four-over-four windows. A precast stone trim is continued at the top of the ground floor and on the bump-outs above the second story, similar to the rest of the building.

The main retail entrance area is inset and located two to four steps above sidewalk level, at the corner of the building closest to the intersection of College Avenue and US 1. Black canvas awnings along the retail building frontage *[and a small portion of sloped roof along the Yale Avenue frontage]* add some more detail to the building. The ground-floor parking area, where it is adjacent to the Yale Avenue building frontage, is screened by a small planting area and **proposed windows with half-rounds at the top** *[perforated metal panels]*. Staff **considers this to be an** *[recommends that any future approval of this DSP require that these panels be replaced with a more]* attractive architectural treatment **that sufficiently screens the parking area** *[and that proposed plantings be designed to provide more year-round visual interest in order to create a more appropriate screen]*.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

8. **The 2010 Approved Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment and the standards of the Development District Overlay Zone (D-D-O-Z):** The 2010 *Approved Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* defines long-range land use and development policies, detailed zoning changes, design standards and a Development District Overlay Zone for the US 1 corridor area. The land use concept of the sector plan divides the corridor into four inter-related areas, Walkable Nodes, Corridor Infill, Existing Neighborhoods, and Natural Areas, for the purpose of examining issues and opportunities and formulating recommendations. Detailed recommendations are provided for six distinct areas within the sector plan, Downtown College Park, University of Maryland, Midtown, Uptown, Autoville and Cherry Hill Road, and Hollywood Commercial District. The overall vision for the Central US 1 Corridor is a vibrant hub of activity highlighted by walkable concentrations of pedestrian- and transit-oriented mixed-use development, the integration of the natural and built environments, extensive use of sustainable design techniques, thriving residential communities, a complete and balanced transportation network, and a world-class educational institution.

The subject property is part of a "Walkable Node" within the Downtown College Park subarea (see Map 8 on page 62). Walkable nodes are intended for pedestrian-friendly, transit-oriented, mixed-use development at appropriate locations along the Central US 1 Corridor. Development should be medium*[-]* to high*[-]*intensity with an emphasis on vertical mixing of uses. Development within a walkable node should generally be between two and six stories in height.

The sector plan (see Map 8 on page 62) recommends a mixed-use commercial land use for the subject property. Mixed-use commercial land uses are described as "Properties that contain a mix of uses which, on the ground floor of the development, are predominantly nonresidential, including commerce, office, institutional, civic, and recreational uses. These properties may include a residential component, but are primarily commercial in nature." At 14,366 proposed square feet, the nonresidential component of the proposed development constitutes just 3.6 percent of the overall development program; however, it constitutes 17 percent of the ground floor of the building, which is approximately 66 percent proposed parking areas.

Section 27-548.25(b) of the Zoning Ordinance requires that the Planning Board find that the site plan meets applicable development district standards in order to approve it. The development district standards are organized into multiple categories: Building Form, Existing Residential, Architectural Elements, Sustainability and the Environment, and Streets and Open Spaces. However, in accordance with the D-D-O-Z review process, modification of the development district standards is permitted. In order to allow the plan to deviate from the development district standards, the Planning Board must find that the alternative development district standards will benefit the development and the development district and will not substantially impair implementation of the sector plan.

The following standards of the D-D-O-Z warrant discussion at this time. As noted in the discussion, the applicant submits that the DSP meets all of the applicable standards and, therefore, has not requested any modifications to these standards.

BUILDING FORM (page 241)

Step-Back Transitions and Landscape Buffers

> **Generally, compatible buildings and uses should be located adjacent to each other. However, along historically commercial strips tall buildings often share rear lot lines with residential buildings.**
>
> **Where corridor infill and walkable node areas are across the street from or share a rear property line with an existing residential area, a stepback transition and/or a landscape buffer shall be required for all new development within the corridor infill and walkable node areas.**
>
> **Stepback transitions are appropriate where corridor infill and walkable node areas are across the street from existing residential areas. This scenario is illustrated in the top two diagrams on this page, where a block that fronts US 1 is across the street from an existing residential block. The tallest buildings shall be located fronting US 1. The development shall step down through the block to a maximum height of two or three stories facing existing residential development. The top image illustrates the use of a mid-block parking garage that is masked by a residential liner building, while the middle image illustrates a surface parking lot that is similarly screened by townhouse liner buildings.**

The applicant has not requested a modification to this standard and provided the following summarized explanation:

> "The zoning governing properties to the east of the property, across Yale Avenue, is R-55. The existing uses are institutional and are not utilized for residential properties. They consist of the City of College Park Police Substation, St. Andrew's Episcopal Church, and the Episcopal Student Center and associated parking. By Section 27-441(b), a church and its accessory uses are defined as 'institutional' and the student center is defined as 'educational,' not 'residential.' By Section 27-441 (b), the Police Station use is defined as 'public/quasi public,' not 'residential.'
>
> "The zoning governing the land to the south of the property on the corner of Yale Avenue and College Avenue is R-18. This zoning extends west from Yale Avenue 150 feet, where it changes to M-U-I. The existing grandfathered use is for the Alpha Omicron Pi Sorority, which is an activity center for sorority events and houses some of the students in the sorority. This student-focused use is inherently compatible with the student-focused mixed-use of the proposed development. The Sector Plan (page 241) provides that compatible buildings and uses should be located adjacent to each other. The proposed development faces three streets, US 1, College Avenue and Yale Avenue. It is only adjacent to another property on its northern boundary. That property is mixed-use/ institutional and the use of the proposed development is compatible with that use of the University owned property on its northern boundary. The proposal respects the existing uses across the streets placing retail on the ground floor across from retail on College Avenue with housing above, and student-focused housing with no retail across from the student-focused sorority and institutional uses on Yale.
>
> "Furthermore, the Alpha Omicron Pi Sorority is zoned for corridor infill and is designated as a walkable node. Finally, the Sector Plan Development Character Map does not refer to the area occupied by the sorority building as 'existing residential.'
>
> "The stepback transition referenced in the above standard, if and where applicable must by the definitions set forth in the sector plan refer to development defined as 'across the street from existing residential areas.' The quoted text is a term defined in the sector plan. As the proposed development is on the border of the sector plan, the properties across from it are governed by the zoning of the existing use. Such zoning does not require a setback on the proposed development. If the sector plan governed properties outside its boundaries, by definition, the existing institutional and quasi-public uses would negate any requirements of the proposed development to 'stepback.' Notwithstanding the above, the proposed building has been designed to be lower, by a full floor in elevation on Yale Avenue, from its height on US 1.
>
> "Last, were the stepback to be 'enforceable,' the proposed maximum height of a building would be governed by the floor to ceiling limitations set forth in the sector plan on page 237 with regard to any stepbacks. Such story limitations are 25 feet for the first floor and 14 feet from finished floor to underside of finished ceiling. Peaked roofs are not limited in height. Thus a three-story building, including two feet of structure between floors, and roof structures, which can reach upwards of 15 to 20 feet, would result in a total structure height of 71 to 76 feet and still comply with overall story restrictions where applicable. The proposed structure has a height at its roof parapet wall of approximately 74 feet."

Staff generally concurs with the applicant's comments about the existing zoning and uses located on the properties across College Avenue and Yale Avenue. However, several issues were portrayed inaccurately by the applicant. For instance, the church and sorority house mentioned above, which is a residence for sorority members, are considered contributing resources within the Old Town College Park Historic District. Based on permit research, the Episcopal Student Center mentioned is in use as a single-family detached dwelling being rented to student interns. Staff concurs that the uses within the proposed building are compatible with the surrounding uses on adjacent properties; however, the standard under discussion deals with Building Form, not uses. Additionally, the term "adjacent," as defined in Section 27-101.01 of the Zoning Ordinance, means nearby, but not necessarily abutting, adjoining, or contiguous. Therefore, all the properties across the public rights-of-way from the property can be considered to be adjacent. Finally, the applicant argues that "existing residential areas" are limited solely to those properties so designated that are located within the sector plan boundaries. The sector plan recognizes the proximity of stable, developed residential areas adjacent to the sector plan boundaries and includes a number of policies and strategies specifically intended to address adjacent communities. Any and all references to existing residential areas in the Sector Plan apply equally to both existing residential properties within the boundaries and residential areas outside the boundaries of the D-D-O-Z.

To summarize, the standard for Step-Back Transitions and Landscape Buffers requires all new development within walkable node areas that is across the street from an existing residential area, to provide a step-back transition such that the development steps down to a maximum height of two to three stories facing existing residential development. The subject property, along its entire Yale Avenue frontage and the easternmost portion of its College Avenue frontage, is across from residentially-zoned, residentially-used, county historic district properties*[, but the proposed building retains its six-story height and does not step-back as required]*. **The current proposed building is four stories high with a two-story sloped roof, along the entire Yale Avenue frontage and for a small portion of the College Avenue frontage.** Therefore, the DSP does not conform to **the letter of** this standard as required. **However, staff finds that the change in building height and design through the block does begin to create a transition between the modern six-story building and the adjacent historic existing residential areas as required by the standard. A more complete and effective transition would be achieved if the four-story portion of the building were continued along the easternmost portion of the College Avenue frontage, within existing Lots 6, 7, and 8, across from the existing sorority house; if the northern and southern ends of the building along the Yale Avenue frontage were reduced to three stories high, with a corresponding reduction in the roof height, to more closely conform to the standard and to provide more definition and visual interest to the roof plane; and if a more logical and gradual transition were provided between the four-story and six-story building portions along the College Avenue frontage. If the applicant were to request an amendment as required by Section 27-548.25(c) of the Zoning Ordinance, staff would recommend approving such an amendment to allow for a three- to four-story building across from the existing residential areas as benefiting the development and the development district and not substantially impairing implementation of the sector plan. Conditions have been included in the Recommendation section of this report requiring these revisions.**

[Furthermore, an amendment to this standard, had one been requested, to allow for the six-story building across from existing residential areas, without any step-back, would have been difficult to justify. It appears to the staff that modification of the standard would not benefit the development district and would substantially impair implementation of the sector plan. The large

scale and mass of the proposed six-story building is incompatible with the surrounding residential and historic district areas and would have a large, negative visual impact on them.]

[Approval of this proposed development would establish a pattern of development and a departure from the standards and goals established in the sector plan which would set a precedent that might make it more difficult to require future developments in the area to fully comply with the sector plan, thereby hindering the development district and impairing the implementation of the sector plan.]

9. **Zoning Ordinance:** The DSP application has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements of the M-U-I Zone and the requirements of the Development District Overlay Zone of the Zoning Ordinance:

a. Section 27-546.19(c), Site Plans for Mixed Uses, requires that:

(c) A Detailed Site Plan may not be approved unless the owner shows:

2. All proposed uses meet applicable development standards approved with the Master Plan, Sector Plan, Transit District Development Plan, or other applicable plan;

Comment: The site plan does not meet all site design guidelines and Development District Standards of the 2010 *Approved Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* as discussed in Finding 8 above. **However, an amendment can be requested by the applicant to the one standard that is not fully met, and the Planning Board should consider such a request a pre-requisite to approval of the project with the architectural design currently proposed.**

5. Compatibility standards and practices set forth below will be followed, or the owner shows why they should not be applied:

(A) Proposed buildings should be compatible in size, height, and massing to buildings on adjacent properties;

Comment: The proposed **four- to** six-story building meets the majority of the size, height, and massing requirements set forth in the sector plan, except for the building step-back transition standard. The majority of existing buildings surrounding the property are two to three stories in height with smaller, more diverse façades. **However, staff believes that the new proposed building design, with revisions recommended below, is more closely compatible with the adjacent properties, and that the reduced building height of four stories does partially mitigate the overall mass of the building. Two additional measures that would help mitigate the mass of the building and make it more compatible with adjacent properties are to add architectural features, such as cross gables or dormers, to the two-story sloped roof to break up its mass and to continue the proposed brick veneer up to and including the fifth story of the building on all elevations. These additional conditions have been included in the Recommendation section of this report in further fulfillment of this**

required finding. *[The subject building's height varies little throughout the block, from 86 to 75 feet above grade, and the proposed elevations are monotonous and fail to break down the block-filling building's mass into elements of a scale consistent with the adjacent properties. Therefore, the proposed building is not compatible in size, height and massing to buildings on adjacent properties.]*

(D) Building materials and color should be similar to materials and color on adjacent properties and in the surrounding neighborhoods, or building design should incorporate scaling, architectural detailing, or similar techniques to enhance compatibility;

Comment: The main proposed building materials include a red-brown brick veneer, **a red brick veneer,** a gray metal panel, and a Hardie panel wall system in two shades of cream. Precast bands and a base along with storefront aluminum windows complete the major façade elements. These building materials and colors are generally similar to those on adjacent properties. **However, to create more compatibility on the building and with the neighborhood, staff recommends that all of the brick veneer on all elevations be the same red color as that shown on the four-story portion of the building.** *[However, the proposed building design does not incorporate scaling or architectural detailing to enhance the building's compatibility with those on adjacent properties.]*

12. **Referral Comments:** The revised subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:

a. **Historic Preservation Section—The Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) did not review the subject revised architecture prior to issuance of this memorandum and, therefore, the recommendation from their October 18, 2011 meeting remains the same.**

b. **Community Planning North Division—The Community Planning North Division was not able to produce an official response to the revised architecture prior to issuance of this memorandum.**

o. **University of Maryland—In a letter dated December 23, 2011, to the applicant, the University invited the applicant to present updated design information at the January 6, 2012 meeting of the University's Architecture and Landscape Review Board. They also restated their concerns about, and opposition to, the project's proposal to tie into the existing campus storm drain system. Staff understands that the proposed meeting date was not feasible for the applicant, but they intend to present to the review board at a meeting on January 13, 2012, after the issuance of this memorandum.**

p. **City of College Park—The City of College Park held a work session to consider the revised architecture on January 3, 2012. On January 10, 2012, the City Council of College Park reviewed the revised architecture and voted unanimously to oppose the DSP.**

13. The subject application [*does not*] adequately take**s** into consideration the requirements of the D-D-O Zone and the sector plan. The amendments to development district standards necessary for this development to be approved are the result of a design that**, if modified in accordance with proposed conditions, will be reasonably responsive to the** *[is incompatible, in regard to]* size, height, and massing, **of** *[with]* buildings on adjacent properties. The amendments to the development district standards that **are** *[would be]* required for this development, would *[not, for these reasons,]* benefit the development of the development district as required by Section 27-548.25(c) of the Zoning Ordinance, and would **not** *[in fact]* substantially impair implementation of the sector plan.

As a result, and as required by Section 27-285(b)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance, the detailed site plan *[does not]* represent**s** 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, the Urban Design Section recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and **APPROVE Detailed Site Plan, DSP-10028, for the Maryland Book Exchange subject to the following conditions:**

1. Prior to signature approval, the detailed site plan (DSP) shall be revised as follows:

a. Change General Note 3 to list 12,525 square feet as the area of green space on-site.

b. Remove the Section 4.7 bufferyard schedule from the plan.

c. Revise the plant schedule to correctly indicate the native plants and revise the Section 4.9 schedule to show the requirements being met.

d. Remove the street trees from the number of shade trees provided in the Section 4.1 schedule on the landscape plan.

e. Revise the plan so that all of the provided handicapped parking spaces are a full 19 feet in length with a striped access aisle adjacent to each.

f. Provide a lighting plan with details, along with hours of illumination, that demonstrates that the site design minimizes glare, light, and other visual intrusions into and impacts on yards, open areas, and building façades on adjacent properties.

g. Provide a more detailed set of sign standards based on the Development District Overlay Zone (D-D-O-Z) requirements for building-mounted signage. The plan shall establish the standards for sign lighting, colors, lettering style, size, height, material, quantity, and location that will be used to regulate building-mounted signage within the proposed sign envelopes.

h. Provide limits to the hours of operation and deliveries demonstrating minimal impacts on adjacent properties.

i. **Add a note to the DSP that all loading area access doors shall remain closed, except during times of entrance and exiting of vehicles.**

j. **Clarify, with notes, which of the City of College Park parallel parking spaces along College Avenue will be eliminated to accommodate the loading access drive.**

k. **Revise General Note 27 to state that the property is within Character Area "WN—Walkable Node," not "5a."**

l. **Label the height of the access to all loading spaces on the site plan.**

m. **Revise the courtyards as follows:**

(1) **For the western, ground-level courtyard, clarify the intended users, the maintenance plan, the planned uses, and any proposed safety measures.**

(2) **For the central and eastern courtyards, clarify the maintenance plan, the planned uses, and any proposed safety measures for the space, and provide a separation between recreation areas and residential unit windows.**

n. **Provide a site circulation plan, including internal parking circulation, per PGCPB Resolution No. 09-170, No. 13, page 17.**

o. **Provide a direct public access route from the parking area to College Avenue, adjacent to the retail spaces.**

p. **Clarify the site's storm drainage outfall design and location to the satisfaction of the University of Maryland, the City of College Park, and the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T). Additionally, provide a legend on the utility plan for clarity.**

q. **Resolve the site plan property lines, if possible, in consultation with the University of Maryland.**

r. **Revise the site notes, lot area, and lot coverage to indicate any areas of dedication for public roadways.**

s. **Revise the general notes on the coversheet to provide information regarding the surplus parcel on the western end of the property.**

t. **Revise the plan to provide a maximum of 98 compact parking spaces.**

2. **Prior to signature approval, the following revisions shall be made to the architectural elevations, to be reviewed by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board:**

a. **In regard to the D-D-O-Z stepback transition standard:**

(1) **Continue the four-story portion of the building along the easternmost portion of the building elevation facing College Avenue, within existing Lots 6, 7, and 8, across from the existing sorority house.**

(2) Along the Yale Avenue frontage, reduce the northern and southern ends of the building to three stories high and reduce the roof height correspondingly in order to provide more variation to the roof plane.

(3) Along the College Avenue frontage, provide a logical and more gradual architectural transition from the four-story building portion to the six-story building portion.

b. Revise the architecture to use the same red color brick on the entire building as is shown on the four-story portion of the building.

c. Revise the fifth story of the building to a brick façade along the College Avenue and Baltimore Avenue (US 1) frontages of the building and on the northern elevation, maintain a brick façade up through and including the fifth story.

d. On the three- and four-story portion of the building, or anywhere there is a sloped roof, provide additional features to break up the roof mass, such as cross-gables, dormers, and/or height variations.

e. The easternmost bump-out on the College Avenue frontage shall have a substantial trim cap similar to that used along Yale Avenue.

3. A disclosure clause shall be placed on final plats and deeds for all properties that notifies prospective purchasers that the property has been identified as being within approximately one mile of a general aviation airport. The disclosure clause shall include the cautionary language from the General Aviation Airport Environment Disclosure Notice.

4. Prior to approval of building permits, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall obtain approval of a final plat pursuant to Section 24-108 of the Subdivision Regulations, for which no preliminary plan is required, to vest the existing development and address the following:

a. Add a note to state that the subject property is exempt from filing a preliminary plan pursuant to Section 24-111(c)(4) of the Subdivision Regulations.

b. Show the dedication of right-of-way along Baltimore Avenue (US 1) and Yale Avenue as reflected on the approved detailed site plan.

c. Add a note to states that the public safety surcharge is applicable for the subject property pursuant to Section 10-192.11(a) of the Prince George's County Code, unless a waiver is granted pursuant to Section 10-192.11(b)(3) by the County Council.

d. Add a note that the development of the subject property shall be in accordance with the approved detailed site plan.

5. Total development within the subject property shall be limited to development which generates no more than 141 AM peak hour and 192 PM peak-hour vehicle trips.

6. **Prior to issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following improvements shall (1) have full financial assurance, (2) have been permitted for construction by the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) for part (a) and the city of College Park for part (b), and (3) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with SHA and the City:**

a. **The provision of any traffic signal modifications, pedestrian/ bike push buttons and count-down displays at all approaches, and inclusion of highly-visible and well delineated pedestrian crosswalks and stop bars on all approaches at the intersections of Baltimore Avenue (US 1) with College Avenue/Regents Avenue, per SHA and the City of College Park Standards.**

b. **The provision of wide pedestrian crosswalks on all approaches of College Avenue with the proposed driveway on College Avenue and the intersection of College Avenue with Yale Avenue, if deemed necessary by the City of College Park.**