September 12, 2012

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Prince George's County Planning Board

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

FROM: Susan Lareuse, Master Planner, Urban Design Section, Development Review Division
Meika Fields, Senior Planner, Urban Design Section, Development Review Division

SUBJECT: Revisions to Staff Report dated August 31, 2012
Detailed Site Plan DSP-10028
Maryland Book Exchange (Remand)

There are necessary amendments to the technical staff report dated August 31, 2012 for Detailed Site Plan DSP-10028, Maryland Book Exchange. The revisions are based upon additional information that has been received since the publication of the staff report.

ADDITIONAL FINDINGS

1. **Prince George's County Police Department**

In a memorandum dated August 31, 2012, the Community Services Division of the Prince George's County Police Department completed a review of the subject application for the purposes of promoting the principles of Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED). The recommendations of the Prince George's County Police Department are as follows:

> "It is my recommendation to have surveillance,(monitored cameras),throughout the building in common areas where crime has the highest probability of occurring (stairwells, parking garage, garbage area) as well as at access points and the courtyards on the upper levels. Access to the building should be controlled through keycards or pass codes to prevent access by individuals that are not residents. Blue light call boxes are recommended on each end, of each level of the parking garage and on the exterior of the building. It is recommended that there be a radio amplifier in the building to ensure that first responders inside the building can have reliable radio transmissions while inside the building."

Comment: The staff recommends the following condition in response to the above:

a. Prior to signature approval of the plans, the following notes shall be added to the

plans:

(1) Monitor cameras shall be placed throughout the building in common areas including stairwells, parking garage, garbage area, access points and the courtyards.

(2) Access to the residential portions of the building shall be controlled through front desk personnel, keycards or pass codes to prevent access by individuals that are not residents or guests.

(3) Blue light call boxes should be located on each end of each level of the parking garage and on the exterior of the building, subject to the approval by the University of Maryland.

(4) Radio amplifiers in the building shall be provided for reliable radio transmissions for first responders while inside the buildings.

2. **The University of Maryland, Architectural and Landscape Review Board (ALRB)**

The University of Maryland was sent a copy of the revised plans, and by letter dated September 10, 2012, Carlo Colelly to Robert Specter, the following information was noted:

"The ALRB held a meeting on September 7, 2012 to review recent design revisions on the subject project. This was the third presentation to the ALRB. ALRB comments on previous presentations to ALRB meetings on December 2, 2011 and January, 2012 are documented in memoranda dated December 5, 2011 and January 17, 2011 respectively (enclosed for ease of reference).

"Ilya Zusin of R&J, LLC, and Brian Ward of Niles Bolton, the developer's architect, presented revised architectural plans, elevations and perspectives focusing on specific comments and concerns expressed by the University in prior review meetings.

"The ALRB acknowledges that the design demonstrates some responsiveness to the concerns about the block massing and density, by reducing the number of floors along the eastern portion of the proposed development. There have been positive revisions to the refinement of material selections by adding brick on the north elevation, and in the streetscape design such as strengthening entrance identification and developing interactive spaces at the ground plane.

"Concerns remain about the overall project scale and density as indicated with continuous edge-to-edge site conditions at the north elevation facing the University and the south elevation facing the City of College Park. The ALRB recommends that there is an opportunity to break down the scale of the structure at the north at a transition in the site geometry. Additionally, the south elevation façades are currently articulated such that they could be developed as three connected buildings rather than solely as an external wrapping of that portion of the block development.

"The ALRB offers the following additional recommendations to the Developer in response to the revised design submission:

"1. Additional study of the project mass and scale should occur to explore options that will improve the block development. The block could be divided and successfully articulated as individual buildings."

Comment: The applicant does not agree with this recommendation and will respond to this condition at the Planning Board hearing in depth. The applicant contends that the building massing, setbacks, and heights for the proposed design follow the sector plan.

"2. Provide design elements that support overall development quality and to elevate the building design, particularly in the selection of materials."

Comment: The applicant does not agree with this recommendation and will respond to this condition at the Planning Board hearing in depth. The applicant contends that the quality of materials, their location and expression on the elevations, and the overall design intent follow the guidelines set out in the Sector plan.

"3. Study reducing the long continuous surface area of the sloped roof on the three story elevation on Yale Ave. Consider dormers to introduce light into the corridors."

Comment: The applicant is willing to incorporate dormers into the sloped roof of the Yale Avenue façade. Staff recommends that prior to signature approval, the plans shall be revised to incorporate dormers in the sloped roof along College and Yale Avenues.

"4. Revise the ground level material selections wrapping the northwest corner of Route I to be consistent with that at the southwest corner."

Comment: The applicant agrees to accept the condition.

"5. Adjust the south service entry overhang to reduce significance. Emphasize the residential building's entry by adding a more pronounced canopy."

Comment: The applicant agrees to accept the condition.

"6. Create consistent window types on second and third floor facade along the College Ave elevation."

Comment: The applicant agrees to accept the condition.

"7. Align ground level retail glazing patterning and the three and five story residential window patterning above ground level on the College Ave. elevation."

Comment: The applicant does not agree with this recommendation and will respond to this condition at the Planning Board hearing in depth. The applicant contends that the design of the window patterning is responsive to the internal functioning of the building. The lowest level window location is visually removed from the upper portions of the building in that the activation of the streetscape through signage, lighting, street trees, bike racks, and pedestrian activity all contribute any perceived exterior vertical alignment issues.

The applicant provided the following response in an email dated September 11, 2012:

"The ground floor differs in use and scale from the residential floors above, and there is no immediate solution to aligning large storefront glazing for commercial/amenity spaces with the smaller residential

windows above. We have designed the elevation to emulate a contemporary renovation of an historical mixed use building, where the base commercial level has its own organization of fenestration and scale."

3. **Historic Preservation Commission (HPC)**

On Thursday, September 6, 2012, the Historic Preservation Commission held a special meeting for the purpose of reviewing DSP-10028, Maryland Book Exchange application which had been remanded by the District Council to the Planning Board on July 25, 2012. The following exerts are provided for the Planning Board's review:

"Old Town College Park Historic District

"1) The subject site is adjacent to the Old Town College Park Historic District (#66-042) which includes properties to the east and south. Properties within the adjacent historic district are generally small-scale (two to four stories), residential or institutional structures with uniform setbacks. The adjacent streetscape is characterized by front and side yards that include sidewalks, lawns, ornamental plantings, and shade trees.

"2) The Old Town College Park Historic District is significant as a local example of the residential subdivisions that emerged with the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth-century expansion of the nation's capital. These suburbs were made possible initially by the presence of railroad lines and subsequently with the proliferation of streetcar lines and thereafter, by the ascendance of the automobile. The historic district includes 216 properties with a total of 295 primary and secondary resources that reflect two periods of significance: the emerging suburb (1889-1950) and the impact of the nearby University of Maryland on the community (1935-1965).

"3) The proposed development of the subject property includes a mixed-use development with below- and at-grade interior parking, ground-floor retail space along Baltimore Avenue and the western end of College Avenue (approximately 13,844 square feet) and upper-level housing (a range of 284-304 units of varying configurations). Access to the building's parking facilities, loading, and service entrances will be provided by entries on the south (College Avenue), east (Yale Avenue), and north elevations. A pedestrian access point to the westernmost courtyard and the rear of the retail space fronting Baltimore Avenue has been provided west of the loading area on College Avenue. A large portion of the block-filling building, with the exception of the west (Baltimore Avenue) elevation and the western portion of the north elevation (facing the University of Maryland campus), will be visible from the historic district.

"4) Because of the compressed review schedule associated with the remand of this application, staff has not been able to review a complete and internally consistent set of plans and elevations and an associated site plan. Further, the applicant may not be in a position to make final selections of some materials and details before review of this application by the Planning Board. As a result, while a number of changes have been proposed to the building elevations that appear to be acceptable as represented in the submitted renderings, staff is uncertain as to the actual character of some proposed details, such as precise brick patterns, carpentry details, precise color and texture selections, spandrel panel details, and cornice treatments. Although the applicant's presentation to the Historic Preservation Commission may address a number of these issues, it is likely that many of these details await final selection. Therefore, these details may require resolution through a recommended condition of approval from the HPC to the Planning Board.

"5) The Old Town College Park Historic District Local Advisory Committee (LAC) met on August 28, 2012 to review the subject application. The LAC voted 5-0 to recommend disapproval of the application and is expected to provide more detailed comments at the September 6, 2012 special meeting of the HPC.

"6) At the Historic Preservation Commission's September 6, 2012 hearing, the HPC received an orientation and presentation by staff, a presentation by the applicant, received comments from the City of College Park Planning Department and legal counsel, comments from the City of College Park Councilmember in whose district the project would be located, comments from the Old Town College Park Historic District Local Advisory Committee (OTCPLAC), and comments from a number of interested citizens and residents of the Old Town College Park Historic District adjacent to the project site. After considering the presentation and testimony and at the conclusion of the discussion, the HPC voted to provide the Planning Board with the recommendations

"At the meeting, staff summarized the details of the application and the applicant, represented by project architect Stephen Gresham of Niles, Bolton Architects and Michele LaRocca, attorney for the applicant, provided additional explanation of the proposed building's organization and architectural character and its design elements and materials. Ms. LaRocca indicated the applicant's support for the recommended conditions provided to the HPC by Historic Preservation Section staff.

"Testimony provided by the City of College Park Planning Director, Terry Schum, and Suellen Ferguson, the City's legal counsel, indicated that the City still felt that the project, even as recently revised, did not address the requirements of the District Councils Order of Remand or the requirements of the *Approved Central US 1 Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (June 2010). The City felt strongly that the required step-downs through the block are still not addressed by the current design and that the two-story roof element along Yale Avenue was not compatible with character of the adjacent Old Town College Park Historic District. These opinions criticisms of the project were echoed by City of College Park Councilmember Stephanie Stullich, Jim McFadden, a member of the OTCPHDLAC, as well as citizens Page Lacey and Kathy Bryant that testified in opposition to the project as currently designed, and Robert Schnabel, who identified himself as a former HPC Commissioner, who stated that had recused himself from reviews of the application while serving on the HPC.

"District Council Order of Remand

"6) The District Council's Order of Remand for DSP-10028 requires a referral of the subject application to the Historic Preservation Commission, in part because the Historic Preservation Commission did not review revisions to the plans after initial HPC review in October 2011. The paragraphs within the Order of Remand most directly relevant to the Historic Preservation Commission's review are included here for reference (without footnotes):

> *15. On remand, the Planning Board shall take further testimony, and allow additional public comments on a detailed site plan that decreases modern-design elements and uses other material that relates better to the architecture in the Old Town Historic District on the north, south, east, and west elevations. Or a plan that employs materials, colors and decorative treatments that are compatible with the historic University of Maryland campus and the Old Town Historic District on all elevations.*
>
> *16. On remand, the Planning Board, after taking further testimony, and allowing additional public comment shall consider the implications of the detailed site plan, as*

amended, in the sector plan area on existing residential neighborhoods. At the time of site plan review, Planning Board, on remand, shall ensure that the proposed development is respectful of adjacent communities. The Plan at 73, Policy 1 and Strategy 1. Referral to Historic Preservation

17. The Plan at 193-201 contains a chapter, in part, on Historic Preservation. The Historic Preservation Commission ("HPC") recommended denial of the design contained in the initial application submitted by the applicant. The HPC however, according to the record, did not review the detailed site plan, as amended, by the applicant, for compliance with §27-281.01.

18. On remand, and pursuant to §27-284, the detailed site plan, as amended, shall be referred to the HPC for compliance with §27-281.01, prior to final action by the Planning Board. After review and receipt of referral comments from HPC, the Planning Board shall make a finding, including but not limited to, whether the detailed site plan, as amended, is compatible with the Old Town College Park Historic District.

"7) The subject application has been referred to the Historic Preservation Commission in compliance with §27-281.01- Detailed Site Plans of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance:

(a) A Detailed Site Plan must be approved, before permits may be issued for any proposed use of:

(1) Property in a zone that requires Detailed Site Plan approval;

(2) Property for which the Planning Board or District Council has expressly required approval of a Detailed Site Plan, in a zoning or subdivision case, a sectional map amendment, or otherwise; or

(3) Property adjacent to a Historic District, excluding additions, garages, and other minor home improvements of already existing buildings.

(b) For purposes of this Section, a property lies "adjacent to" a district if any part of the property touches or adjoins the Historic District, including without limitation properties adjoining (by subdivision) across public rights-of-way, or the property lies in an enclave of the Rural Tier, completely surrounded by lands in the Developing Tier. For property adjacent to a Historic District, the Detailed Site Plan shall address the following items, to ensure that the development complements the character of the Historic District: building siting, setbacks, height and massing, building materials, facade treatments and architectural expression, landscaping, fences and walls, accessory structures, lighting, paving materials, and signs. (CB-36-2006)

"8) The subject property has had extensive ground disturbance by previous development, including construction of the current Maryland Book Exchange building and associated parking lot. A search of current and historic photographs, topographic and historic maps, and locations of currently known archeological sites indicates the probability of archeological sites within the subject property is low. Phase I archeology survey is not recommended on the subject property.

"9) 'Chapter Three: Development Pattern' of the *Approved Central US 1 Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (June 2010) provides policies and strategies with Corridor-wide application that are relevant to the review of the subject proposal (pp. 63-64):

"Policy 4: Ensure that development in the Central US 1 Corridor does not adversely impact the character of existing residential neighborhoods.

"Strategy 1. Implement a transition in building density and intensity from more intense uses within the walkable nodes and corridor infill areas to less intense uses within and adjacent to residential neighborhoods.

"Strategy 5. Ensure that redevelopment of Downtown College Park does not adversely impact the properties located within the Old Town College Park Historic District.

"10) Chapter Three also provides policies and strategies applicable to identified Walkable Nodes such as the one in which the subject application is located (p.68):

> *"Policy 3: Create appropriate transitions between the higher-intensity walkable nodes and existing residential neighborhoods.*

"Strategy 1: Develop townhouses or small apartment buildings between two and three stories in height as a transition between the walkable nodes and single-family detached dwellings. This type of development helps protect neighborhood integrity and provides a smooth transition from lower to higher intensities of use.

"11) 'Chapter Six: Implementation' of the *Approved Central US 1 Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (June 2010) provides Development District Standards that prescribe the manner in which the form, organization, and massing of new and infill construction within the plan boundaries are to be addressed (p.227). With particular relevance to the subject application, these standards require step-back transitions and landscape buffers for new construction adjacent to existing residential areas such as the Old Town College Park Historic District (p.238). Specifically, the Sector Plan requires (emphasis added):

> *"Where corridor infill and walkable nodes 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...The tallest building shall be located fronting US1.* ***The development shall step down through the block to a maximum height of two or three stories facing existing residential development****.*

"Conclusions

"Old Town College Park Historic District

"1) The probability of archeological sites within the subject property is low. Phase I archeology survey is not recommended on the subject property.

"2) The subject application proposes the construction of a large mixed- use building that will be six stories above grade at Baltimore Avenue, step down to five stories and four stories above grade at the approximate mid-point of the College Avenue elevation, and then steps down further to three stories above grade along the eastern one-third of the College Avenue elevation along Yale Avenue. The two primary portions of the north elevation facing the University of Maryland campus are proposed to be six-stories each but with a minor reduction in height from west to east to reflect the declining grade of the property; only 50 feet of the eastern end of the north elevation steps down to three-stories at Yale Avenue. As a result, the building will be substantially visible from all compass points, and will have a significant visual impact on the adjacent historic district which is of a low-rise and generally residential character.

"District Council Order of Remand

"3) As currently conceived, this project includes a variety of architectural conceits and can be considered to be a combination of "contemporary" and "traditional" or "historicist" elements. The building employs both traditional masonry (various arrangements and colors of brick and cast stone) and modern, non-masonry materials (HardiPlank, EIFS, metal sheathing, and metal-clad windows).

"A critical issue facing this project is the building's complicated massing. The visual impact of any building's mass, which is dictated by both height and surface covered, depends on the various relationships between length, width, and height, and the overall proportions of these elements and the details applied to them. Taken as a whole, the south (College Avenue) elevation is articulated with volumes of descending height from west to east. The scheme effectively addresses the direction provided by the Order of Remand and the requirements of the Approved Central US 1 Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment (June 2010). The proposed design does not treat the north elevation in the same manner as the west, south, and east elevations and as a result, the north elevation does not conform to the changes wrought elsewhere in the composition.
The six-story western portion of the building along Baltimore Avenue has a three-part Beaux Arts organization that includes a "base", a "field", and a "top". Other sections of the building share a well-defined base (or first story) which is surmounted by fields of varying heights which terminate in a range of cornice treatments. Only the western volume of the building employs a substantial crowning element, and this appropriately prioritizes this portion of the building at the major public street. However, given the building's overall height of six-stories, the two-story "top" appears to be over-scaled. If the use of masonry to sheath the fifth floor is not possible because of the limits of the structural system to be employed, the applicant should be directed to enhance the decorative treatment of the upper two stories of the north, west and south elevations at Baltimore Avenue with additional and varied texture and a color scheme that helps minimizes the expanses of non-masonry materials used in this location. Since this area uses non-masonry materials, enhancements should focus on the provision of features that provide for more dimension, texture, pattern and color to extend the treatments applied to lower stories of the building in this location.

"The College Avenue elevation is the well resolved. To the east of the six-story element at Baltimore Avenue there is a slightly lower, five-story element sheathed exclusively in modern, non-masonry materials. The varied used of some of the same materials found to the west effectively differentiates one volume from the other and signals a change in scale as the elevation steps down to the east. Further to the east is a four-story element, clad entirely in brick that continues to breakdown the mass of the overall composition and transition to the three-story element on the eastern third of the elevation, which employs masonry materials (brick and

masonry trim) and a regular fenestration pattern to enhance the compatibility of the eastern portion of the building with the adjacent low-scale, historic district to the south and east.
As a whole, the building's north elevation is not well-resolved. The same level of attention, articulation, and thoughtful use of materials seen in the College Avenue elevation is not present here. This element of the design remains monolithic, under-articulated, and provides little visual variety across the composition. Although the treatment of the northeast corner of the building has been enhanced to more closely reflect the importance of this location, and the western portion of the six-story volume has been clad with masonry to the fourth story, the remainder of the north elevation appears to have been treated as a rear elevation and is unrelentingly repetitive. Since this building has frontage on three public streets and is substantially visible from the adjacent University of Maryland campus, effectively, there is no rear elevation."
"The current treatment will emphasize the substantial mass of the building rather than de-emphasize it. The lack of texture, light, shadow and variation across the north elevation should be addressed. Any number of devices could be used to more effectively differentiate parts of this elevation. The use of differing but compatible materials, colors, and decorative treatments for portions of the building, along with a more modulated massing and step-down would substantially lessen the massiveness of this portion of the building, which is highly visible from Baltimore Avenue and from the University of Maryland campus.
The applicant should be directed to re-examine this elevation to provide for an additional step down across its length; the two largest sections to the west are both six stories with a minor step down as a result of a change in grade. The transition for the center six-story section to the three-story section to the east should be adjusted to provide for another transition. This could be accomplished with the removal of a small section of the sixth story adjacent to the sloped roof of the three-story volume at the northeast corner of the building. This would result in the loss of only three units."

"4) **Paragraph 15**—As currently proposed the project complies with the language of paragraph 15 of the Order of Remand in a limited manner. Specifically, the number of "modern-design elements" and "uses other material that relates better to the architecture of the Old Town Historic District" on east and southeast elevations (Yale Avenue and the eastern portion of College Avenue) have been reduced. The project only partially complies with paragraph 15 on the west, north, and the western portion of the south (College Avenue) elevation. To address this deficiency, the applicant should be directed to re-examine the details, decoration, and articulation of the west elevation and the western portions of the north and south elevations as well as re-think the remainder of the north elevation. Modifications should be designed to enhance the distinctions between architectural volumes and break down the massiveness of this elevation with enhanced masonry and carpentry details including but not limited to the use of brick, cast stone, textured and decorative siding and sheathing materials, cornice treatments (which should be consistent and logically across the entire building composition) and the use of color to differentiate building elements and volumes."

"5) **Paragraph 16**—As currently proposed, much of the eastern portion of the project, along Yale Avenue and the eastern portion of College Avenue, is "respectful of adjacent communities." This portion of the project is three-stories in height to the cornice line and is surmounted by a two-story hip roof. The "traditional" architectural detailing of this portion of the project is generally compatible with the adjacent community, the Old Town College Historic Park Historic District , as prescribed by the Order of Remand and the language of the *Approved Central US 1 Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment (June 2010).* Although the sloped roof of the Yale Avenue elevation wraps the northeast corner of the building to a depth of 50 feet, the taller elements of the north elevation to the west are visible from the historic district in a somewhat unresolved manner. The conjunction between the lower-scaled "traditional" architecture of the eastern

portion of the building and the slightly taller middle sections of the building is more effectively resolved on College Avenue elevation than on the north elevation where the building volumes are not the same. This is the expression of the overly complex massing of the building, which could be partially resolved with a reduction in height from six to five stories on this portion of the north elevation."

"6) **Paragraphs 17 and 18**-The application reviewed by the Historic Preservation Commission on October 18, 2011, was revised after its review by the HPC and before review and approval by the Planning Board in January 2012. The current application represents a number of changes to the project as approved by the Planning Board and appealed by the City of College Park. Both Historic Preservation Section and Urban Design Section staff has worked with the applicant and with the City of College Park since the District Council's Order of Remand was issued on July 25, 2012, anticipating a review of the application by the Historic Preservation Commission in compliance with the Order of Remand and §27-281.01 of the Zoning Ordinance, to enable the Historic Preservation Commission to provide the Planning Board with findings, conclusions, and recommendations on the compatibility of the project with the adjacent Old Town College Park Historic District."

Comment: Based on testimony received on September 6, 2012, provided by the City of College Park staff, and the HPS staff, the HPC adopted the following conditions :

"1. Provide a step down through the block by separating the 6-story building from the 3-story building and providing a 30-foot alley at approximately the R-18 zoning line. No further step downs would be required. Loading and parking access to be provided via the alley."

Comment: The applicant is opposed to the condition above and will provide a detailed response at the Planning Board hearing.

"2. Eliminate the 2-story, sloped hip roof. The third floor of the three story building fronting Yale Avenue could be a 1-story gable roof with dormers permitting habitation.

Comment: The applicant is opposed to the condition above and will provide a detailed response at the Planning Board hearing.

"3. Revise the building at the corner of Route 1 and College Avenue to meet the street in a more traditional way and to remove the sidewalk encroachment. Route 1 storefront access should be at grade facing Route 1."

Comment: The applicant is opposed to the condition above. The plans indicate three doors at the front of the building along Route 1 which will access the store. These doors are located at grade.

The applicant provided the following response in an e-mail dated September 12, 2012:

"The design of the corner of the building at Route 1 and College Avenue works to resolve many issues at various scales:

a) The ground floor retail pulls back from the corner to create space for a front door that is distinct from the sidewalks; the space allows informal gathering, and steps formed by the change

in grade give the space a terrace-like feel. The floors above protect the front door from the elements. These are all traditional methods of working with grade, establishing a front door, and providing a scale of ground floor openness that relates to surrounding densities of expected pedestrians.

b) Route 1 storefront access is indeed at grade facing Route 1. The HPC is not correctly reading either the Architectural or Civil plans."

"4. Reduce the use of hardipanel for cornice treatments and bays and improve the vertical articulation of all facades by providing local symmetry and increasing bay projections."

Comment: The applicant is opposed to the condition above and will provide a detailed response at the Planning Board hearing.

"5. Revise the composition of the front façade to minimize the impact of the metal towers and be more harmonious with surrounding buildings."

Comment: The applicant is opposed to the condition above and will provide a detailed response at the Planning Board hearing.

The applicant provided the following response in an email dated September 12, 2012:

"The design of the metal-paneled towers at the Route 1 corners of the project are to give visual punctuation to those corners and a vertically oriented counterpoint to the more horizontal facades of the rest of the elevation's composition. As the project stands at what could be seen as the southern gateway to the University of Maryland, the tower elements follow the Sector Plan's Architectural Elements 'Landmark Features' suggestions for Tower and Lantern Elements. The tower on the Northwest corner has been revised per the University's suggestions to more closely mirror or provide symmetry with the Southwest (Rte 1/College) corner."

"6. Prior to signature approval, the applicant shall revise the fifth and sixth stories of the north, west and south elevations of the westernmost (Baltimore Avenue) portion of the building to provide for enhanced architectural detailing that shall include but not be limited to: enhanced masonry and/or carpentry details, such as brick, cast stone, textured and decorative siding and sheathing materials such as HardiPlank, and enhanced cornice treatments (which shall be consistent and logically applied across the entire building composition), and the use of color to differentiate building elements and volumes."

Comment: The applicant is opposed to the condition above and will provide a detailed response at the Planning Board hearing.

"7. Prior to signature approval, the applicant shall revise the two center portions of the building's north elevation to provide for significantly enhanced architectural detailing that shall include but not be limited to: enhanced masonry and brick, cast stone, textured and decorative siding and sheathing materials such as HardiPlank, and enhanced cornice treatments (which should be consistent and logically applied across the entire building composition), and the use of color to differentiate building elements and volumes."

Comment: The applicant is opposed to the condition above and will provide a detailed response at the Planning Board hearing.

4. **The City of College Park**

The City of College Park reviewed the revised plans in response to the Remand Order dated July 24, 2012, and provided the staff the motion and conditions in an e-mail dated September 12, 2012 (see attachment). Due to the date and time of receipt of the City Council recommendation, Urban Design staff has not had the opportunity to provide a written response.

REVISED RECOMMENDATIONS

Based upon the foregoing evaluation and analysis, the Urban Design Section recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and APPROVE the revised plans associated with the remanded Detailed Site Plan, DSP-10028, the Maryland Book Exchange, subject to the conditions below. The conditions include all that were previously approved by the Planning Board (PGCPB Resolution No. 12-06), and new underlined and [bracketed] conditions to be revised as recommended by staff in response to the Order of Remand dated July 24, 2012.

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 or the correct amount shown on the revised DSP, 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 revised lighting plan with details of building-mounted light fixtures and lighting locations, 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.] The plan shall indicate adequate lighting levels on the north side of the building, and that the ultimate lighting design does not detrimentally spill over into adjacent residential areas.

   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 commercial hours of operation and deliveries, commercial and otherwise, 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. Label the height of the access to all loading spaces on the site plan.

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

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

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

o. Revise the plan to [provide] reflect the number of units proposed, not to exceed 304 units. The plan shall also provide the corresponding number of parking spaces [a maximum of 98 compact parking spaces] allowed.

p. Indicate on the plans the dust and noise control procedures to be employed during the demolition and grading phases of site work. No dust should cross over the property lines to impact the neighboring communities.

q. Indicate on the plans that construction vehicles entering the construction site should be directed away from the residential areas surrounding the site. Trucks should not be allowed to line up in residential areas waiting to enter the construction site.

r. Revise the landscape plan to provide for additional landscaping, details, and specifications for the westernmost courtyard.

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

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

b. The first floor of the buildings north elevation shall provide some transparency into and out of the garage for greater visual interest for pedestrians moving along that edge of the building and enhanced natural surveillance for that area.

c. The plans shall be revised to clearly indicate how the breezeway is to be lighted and directional signage for the pedestrians.

d. Revise the architectural elevations and the floor plans to indicate that the transitional step-down of the building from the sixth floor to the fifth floor on the eastern portion of the building be revised so that the step down will extend from the current location as shown on the south elevation through the block to the angled bend on the north elevation of the building. The north elevation shall be revised to reflect the step down by

eliminating the sixth floor from the easternmost portion of the elevation and will result in the loss of approximately three units, as shown on the floor plans.

e. Revise the building's northern side of the east elevation to provide a consistent exterior treatment similar to that proposed for the southeast corner of the building where the main building transitions to the hip roof. Also, the exposed fifth and sixth floors as shown on the east elevation shall specify materials and window fenestration as appropriate.

f. Provide final elevations and floor plans that reflect all architectural changes contained in the conditions above and below, including the materials, details and specifications.

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 state 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 or the surcharge is deemed inapplicable.

   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.

7. Prior to signature approval of the plans, the following notes shall be added to the plans:

a. Monitor cameras shall be placed throughout the building in common areas including stairwells, parking garage, garbage area, access points and the courtyards.

b. Access to the residential portions of the building shall be controlled through front desk personnel, keycards or pass codes to prevent access by individuals that are not residents or guests.

c. Blue light call boxes should be located on each end of each level of the parking garage and on the exterior of the building, subject to the approval by the University of Maryland.

d. Radio amplifiers in the building shall be provided for reliable radio transmissions for first responders while inside the buildings.

8. Prior to signature approval, the plans shall be revised to incorporate dormers in the sloped roof along College and Yale Avenues.

9. Prior to signature approval, revise the ground level material selections wrapping the northwest corner of Route I to be consistent with that at the southwest corner.

10. Prior to signature approval, adjust the south service entry overhang to reduce significance. Emphasize the residential building's entry by adding a more pronounced canopy.

11. Prior to signature approval, create consistent window types on second and third floor facade along the College Ave elevation.

12. Prior to signature approval, the applicant shall revise the fifth and sixth stories of the north, west and south elevations of the westernmost (Baltimore Avenue) portion of the building to provide for enhanced architectural detailing that shall include but not be limited to: enhanced masonry and/or carpentry details, such as brick, cast stone, textured and decorative siding and sheathing materials such as HardiPlank, and enhanced cornice treatments (which shall be consistent and logically applied across the entire building composition), and the use of color to differentiate building elements and volumes.

13. Prior to signature approval, the applicant shall revise the two center portions of the building's north elevation to provide for significantly enhanced architectural detailing that shall include but not be limited to: enhanced masonry and brick, cast stone, textured and decorative siding and sheathing materials such as HardiPlank, and enhanced cornice treatments (which should be consistent and logically applied across the entire building composition), and the use of color to differentiate building elements and volumes.