

R E S O L U T I O N

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

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on Thursday, October 20, 2016, regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-07079-01 for LIDL (College Park), the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** With the subject detailed site plan (DSP), the applicant proposes to construct a 36,185-square-foot food and beverage store. The DSP coversheet should be revised to clarify the use of a food and beverage store rather than “Commercial/Retail.”
2. **Location:** The subject property is located on the east side of Baltimore Avenue (US 1) in the northeast quadrant of its intersection with Berwyn Road, at 8601 Baltimore Avenue. The site is in Planning Area 66, Council District 3. The site is zoned Mixed Use-Infill (M-U-I) and is subject to the Development District Overlay (D-D-O) Zone standards found in the 2010 *Approved Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (Approved Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and SMA).
3. **Surrounding Uses:** The subject site is bounded to the north by a gas station and associated food and beverage store in the M-U-I/D-D-O Zones and multifamily dwellings in the Multifamily-Medium Density Residential (R-18) Zone; to the south by Berwyn Road and beyond, by an auto parts use in the M-U-I/D-D-O Zones and single-family detached dwellings in the One-Family Detached Residential (R-55) Zone; to the east, by 48th Avenue and beyond, by single-family detached dwellings in the R-55 Zone; and, to the west, Baltimore Avenue (US 1) and beyond, by various commercial retail uses and a car wash in the M-U-I/D-D-O Zones.
4. **Development Data Summary:**

	EXISTING	APPROVED
	M-U-I/D-D-O	M-U-I/D-D-O
Zone(s)	Hotel	Food and Beverage Store
Use(s)	Hotel	Food and Beverage Store
Acreage	3.30	3.30
Parcel(s)	1	1
Total gross floor area (sq. ft.)	42,780	36,185

OTHER DEVELOPMENT DATA

Parking Requirements (per Sector Plan)	Required	Provided
Grocery Store 36,185 sq. ft. @4/1,000 sq. ft.	145	133*
Handicap Spaces	5	5 (Including 2 van spaces)
Bike Parking (per Sector Plan)		
@1/3 vehicle spaces	49	35
Loading Spaces (per Section 27-582)***		
10,000-100,000 GFA	1 space	2 spaces

Notes:

* An amendment to the Development District Standards requirement is requested.

** The parking table should be revised to provide the correct dimensions for the ADA parking spaces (8 feet by 19 feet). In addition, the site plan should show sidewalk ramps.

*** The Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and SMA does not have specific requirements for the number of loading spaces; therefore, the applicable section of the Zoning Ordinance serves as the requirement. The parallel loading spaces should be clearly labeled and dimensioned on the site plan.

5. **Prior Approvals:** The subject property was not previously subject to a preliminary plan of subdivision. The 2010 *Approved Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* retained the property in the Development District Overlay/Mixed-Used-Infill (D-D-O/M-U-I) Zone. The site has a previously approved Detailed Site Plan, DSP-07079 approved August 13, 2008 at the Planning Director level, for the existing Clarion Inn which will be demolished after the approval of the subject DSP.

The subject property also has an approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan, 15742-2016 dated June 7, 2016 and valid until June 7, 2019.

6. **Design Features:** The applicant is proposing a one-story, 36,185-square-foot grocery store oriented toward Baltimore Avenue. Access (US 1) to the structure is via a right-in, right-out driveway from US 1, and a two-way driveway from Berwyn Road. The building is located in the northwest portion of the site, with parking along the entire frontage of Berwyn Road on its south side and along the entire frontage of 48th Avenue on its east side, creating an “L” configuration. Loading is provided on the east side of subject site between the building and parking area. Trash enclosures are provided at the end of the parking area along 48th Avenue, in proximity to the northern property line. A four-foot-high brick screen wall is shown along the frontage of Berwyn Road, and a retaining wall is shown along a portion of the northern property line. Details for both walls should be provided. In addition, the location of the proposed bus shelter should be shown on the plan.

Architecture

The building design is primarily distinguished by the sloping asymmetric roofline that frames the front glazed façade along US 1. The roofline slopes from south (at almost 30 feet in height) to the north (at approximately 17 feet in height) and is constructed of thermoplastic (TPO). The front (west) façade consists of a full glazed window treatment with brick and a cast stone sill wrapping around the building on one side. All other sides of the building are clad with a combination of brick and stucco in a complementary color scheme. On the south elevation, facing Berwyn Road, a band of clerestory windows are set apart from the curving roof structure. Brick panels are provided at the ends as well as the center of this façade that anchor the structure to the ground. A brick watertable wraps around to the east elevation. A series of stucco panels in between provide visual contrast. On the north elevation a narrow band of windows are provided along the upper expanse over a stucco finish. A brick panel anchors the building at one end. The east elevation, which is oriented toward 48th Street and which faces a parking area, consists of a brick watertable with a contrasting cast stone sill that transitions to the stucco panels above. A metal screen wall hides the rooftop mechanical equipment. The color elevations should be revised to include all dimensions, identify all architectural elements, and label all building materials for those elements.

Amenities—The revised site plan shows a pedestrian plaza at the US 1/Berwyn Road corner which serves as a focal point and place-making feature that will include a public art element. Manufacturer specifications for the plaza brick pavers, which also wrap around the front entrance to the building, should be provided. Six landscape boxes planted with shade trees are proposed along US 1 with benches on both north and south sides. The applicant is providing a charging station for electric cars, as well as 10 bikeshare spaces and 25 regular bicycle parking spaces. Details for the bike share have been provided; however, details for the U-shaped bike racks also should be provided.

Signage—The applicant submitted a sign plan that includes freestanding and building-mounted project identification signage. The applicant is proposing two building-mounted signs with the brand logo approximately 67.3 square feet each in area on the west and south elevations, in conformance with the D-D-O sign area standards. The applicant is requesting an amendment from the D-D-O standard that prohibits internally lit signs. Color details of the signage should be provided on the sign detail sheet that identify the sign material and clarify that the signs are internally lit. The applicant is also proposing one monument sign at the US 1 entrance to the site. A metal panel eight feet in height and approximately six and-one-half feet wide is proposed, to which a plastic sign with the brand logo is affixed, approximately 24 square feet in sign area. The monument sign includes a curved metal overhang feature that mimics the building roofline. As monument signs are prohibited in the D-D-O, the applicant is requesting an amendment to the applicable D-D-O sign standard which is discussed in Finding 7 below.

Lighting—A Photometric Plan was provided with this application. The DSP, Landscape Plan and photometric plans should be revised to show the number and placement of pedestrian lighting along US 1, with the latter also showing the pedestrian lighting footprints. Streetlight fixture heights should generally be no higher than 15 feet in accordance with the development district

standards in the Approved Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan (page 266). In addition, the photometric plan should show that no light trespass will impact the residential condominiums to the north. All lighting details should clearly indicate the height of the specific poles proposed.

Green Building Techniques—The applicant has provided a list of sustainable features and green building techniques. See Finding 7(a)(17) for further discussion.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **The 2010 Approved Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment and the standards of the Development District Overlay (D-D-O) Zone:** The 2010 *Approved Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Adopted Sectional Map Amendment* (Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and SMA) defines long-range land use and development policies, detailed zoning changes, design standards, and superimposes a Development District Overlay (D-D-O) Zone on the US 1 corridor. The purpose of the standards is to shape high-quality public spaces with buildings and other physical features to create a strong sense of place for College Park and the University of Maryland. The land use concept of the sector plan divides the entire area into four Character Areas: Natural Area, Existing Residential, Corridor Infill and Walkable Node. The subject property is primarily located in the Corridor Infill character area, with a small area in the eastern portion of the site in the Existing Residential character area.

The vision for Central US 1 is a vibrant hub of activity highlighted by walkable concentrations of pedestrian and transit-oriented mixed-use development, 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.

Section 27-548.25(b) of the Zoning Ordinance requires that the Planning Board find that the site plan meets the applicable development district standards in order to approve it. The development district standards are organized into several categories: Building Form, Architectural Elements, Sustainability and the Environment, and Streets and Open Spaces. However, in accordance with the D-D-O Zone review process as stated in Section 27-548.25(c), 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.

If approved with conditions, the subject application will conform to all of the recommendations and requirements, except for those from which the applicant has requested an amendment. In areas where the amendment is approved, the Planning Board finds that granting of the amendment will not substantially impair implementation of the sector plan.

- a. The applicant requests amendments of the following development district standards:
- (1) **Building Form, Character Area 4, Corridor Infill** (page 233)
Building Configuration
 - **Principal Building Height, 4 stories max. 2 min.**

Applicant's Justification:

“The front façade of the proposed building, along the frontage of US 1 (Baltimore Avenue), is approximately 29’7” in height...The roofline transitions along the frontage to the north to a height of 17 feet...[T]he applicant contends that although the proposed building meets the strict definition of a one-story building, the actual height of the building meets the purpose and intent of the development standard by providing a building that is almost 30 total feet in height. Moreover, the building’s massing is designed to reflect its surroundings. It varies between approximately 17 feet to almost 30 feet in height along US 1 (Baltimore Avenue). As it approaches the corner of Berwyn Road, the elevation reaches its highest point, which is carried around to the southern elevation facing Berwyn Road. It should also be noted that the eastern side of the property is located in the Existing Residential Character area; consequently, the dimensions proposed create a human scale to the project, while meeting the intent of the sector plan to have buildings that are more than 11 – 25 feet in height (or one story).”

The height of the proposed single-story building actually varies from approximately 15.5 to almost 30 feet (at its highest point above the entrance) along the frontage of US 1. As this configuration provides the desired street wall appropriate for a walkable urban environment, the Planning Board supports this amendment.

- (2) **Building Form, Character Area 4, Corridor Infill** (page 233)
Building Configuration
 - **Stories may not exceed 14 feet in height from finished floor to finished ceiling, except for a first floor commercial use, which must be a minimum of 11 ft. with a maximum of 25 ft.**

Applicant's Justification: See above.

The proposed one-story building varies from approximately 15.5 to almost 30 feet in height, which exceeds the standard above. As noted above, the Planning Board finds that the design of the building creates the desired street wall and, therefore, supports the amendment request.

(3) **Building Form, Character Area 4, Corridor Infill** (page 233)

- **Lot Occupation**
- **Frontage Buildout, 60% min. at BTL**

Applicant's Justification: The applicant provided the following justification in response to this requirement:

“In an attempt to meet as many of the development district standards as possible, the applicant reconfigured the building placement and location on-site by shifting the building to the west (along US 1); thereby, adhering to the front BTL (principal) requirement. However, in order to accommodate safe internal circulation (both pedestrian and vehicular) and to accommodate the necessary access and loading (with truck circulation), the applicant is proposing the layout shown on the detailed site plan that provides for an access on to US 1 and parking to the south of the building, which will assist in keeping some traffic off of Berwyn Road.”

The applicant is providing only 32 percent building frontage buildout, where 60 percent is required. Because of the specific parking and security needs of the use, it is not practical to provide the required building frontage. The Planning Board supports the amendment request.

(4) **Building Form, Character Area 4, Corridor Infill** (page 233)

- **Setbacks—Building**
- **g.2 Front BTL Secondary, 10 ft. min., 20 ft. max.**

Applicant's Justification: The applicant provided the following justification in response to this requirement:

“...[T]he proposed site and streetscape amenities (including brick pavers, benches, planters, and a bus shelter) will contribute to an attractive, coordinated development. That is, the proposed Landscape Plan was prepared in accordance with the provisions of the Sector Plan and the Landscape Manual, and the materials used will be of high quality and will be attractive, which will enhance the use and enjoyment of the site. This location is anticipated to be used by alternate modes of transportation such as bikes as well as pedestrian access, so outdoor amenities and landscaping are proposed at multimodal scale. The site plan shows details of the outdoor pavers, planters, a bus shelter, and seating area, which will enhance the patron's use and enjoyment of the site by creating a plaza-like environment at the front of the store and along the US 1 frontage. The State Highway Administration has an improvement plan for this portion of US 1 that include a bus shelter on the frontage of the property. The site proposes two seating areas. The first is along US 1, with a bench located on both the north and south sides of each of the landscape planters, for six benches total. The second wraps around the southwest corner of the site

from US 1 to Berwyn Road. The plaza frontage on US 1 proposes two benches, one on either side of the landscape planter, and the frontage on Berwyn Road proposes four benches. The proposed seating areas greatly enhance the pedestrian realm by providing rest areas and shade for the pedestrians and patrons of the store. The design of the site is also dictated by the environs of the property that include existing residential units to the south and east. To effectively buffer the use, as well as to provide environmental site design for stormwater management, the applicant contends that its layout is acceptable. Along Berwyn Road, the applicant is proposing three micro-bioretenion facilities to treat stormwater. In addition, and as provided on the Landscape Plan (Sheet 9), the applicant is proposing a number of shade trees, ornamental trees, and shrubs to buffer the parking lot and use.”

The site plan shows a large surface parking lot along the secondary frontage along Berwyn Road, with a building setback of 130 feet. The applicant does not specifically address the setback; however, the Planning Board finds the design of the site, as proposed, will not substantially impair the sector plan.

(5) **Building Form/ Parking/ Number of Spaces** (page 239)

- **Retail (including eating or drinking establishments)**
4/1000 sq. ft.

Applicant’s Justification: The applicant provided the following justification in response to this requirement:

“Based on the proposed use and building, as indicated on the detailed site plan (Sheet 4), the required number of parking spaces is 145 spaces. The applicant is proposing a total of 134 spaces, which is 11 spaces below what is required. Three of the required spaces will be designated for electric cars and will provide charging stations. Therefore, the applicant is requesting a modification to the development district standard to allow the proposed parking.

“Although the applicant’s proposed parking is less than that which is required, the parking lot has been designed to provide safe and efficient vehicular and pedestrian circulation within the site with parking spaces designed to be located near the use that it serves, and parking aisles have been oriented and designed to minimize the number of parking lanes crossed by pedestrians. Moreover, although the applicant was unable to utilize the shared parking factor, the applicant contends that by providing less parking than what is required positions the development to be more in line with the purpose of the Sector Plan by reducing auto dependency while reflecting the benefits of shared parking facilities. Simply put, a use that provides less parking in the Corridor Infill Character Area than that which is required should be encouraged and not discouraged, as the same encourages pedestrian activity and alternate modes of transportation. Moreover, the applicant is proposing a pedestrian plaza along US 1 that includes a bus stop with shelter and benches. Given the

location of the subject property within the City of College Park and in close proximity to the University of Maryland and the Berwyn community, the applicant contends that the modification to deviate from the required number of parking is warranted.”

There is a bus stop along the US 1 frontage. Any reduction in parking encourages alternate means of access to the proposed use which is preferred by the sector plan. In addition, the site also provides bicycle parking and may also include a third-party bikeshare program. The Planning Board supports this amendment request.

(6) **Building Form/Parking** (page 239)
Number of Spaces

- **Within the corridor infill and walkable node area, a minimum of one bicycle parking space shall be provided within the public or private frontage for every three vehicular spaces. Bicycle racks shall be placed in highly visible locations along the street or within parking garages as appropriate.**

Applicant’s Justification: No justification by the applicant was provided.

The Approved Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan requires that 49-bicycle parking spaces be provided. Twenty-five bicycle parking spaces are proposed and shown on the site plan. The applicant is also working with the City of College Park to install a bikeshare for 10 bicycles.

(7) **Building Form/Parking Access** (page 241)

- **When alleys are not present, secondary frontage or side streets may be used as the primary source of access to off-street parking.**

Applicant’s Justification: The applicant provided the following justification in response to this requirement:

“When alleys are not present, “secondary frontage or side streets *may* be used as the primary source of access to off-street parking.” (Emphasis added). Alleys do not exist; consequently, the only form of access to the site is primary and secondary streets. ...[T]he applicant is...using the same number of existing access points from the primary and secondary streets to access the off-street parking. Given there are no alleys available and this design requirement provides flexibility in the use of the word “may,” the applicant contends that by utilizing the same number of access points – although in slightly different locations that result in better design, safety, circulation, and access – the requested modification does not impair the implementation of the Sector Plan...Site access to and from US 1 has been coordinated with the State Highway Administration. The design of the access to off-street parking also ensures that the requisite delivery truck has minimal

impacts to the primary and secondary streets, while also ensuring safe on-site circulation and movement.”

The standard above requires, where alleys do not exist, that access be provided from secondary frontage or side streets. Where the latter are not present, access may then be provided from the primary frontage street. In this case a secondary street (Berwyn Road) provides access to the site. However, a limited right-in and right-out access is also provided from an existing access point from US 1, the primary frontage street. Because the access from US 1 currently exists on the site, the Planning Board supports the amendment request.

(8) **Building Form, Character Area 4, Corridor Infill** (page 241)

- **The vehicular access drive of a parking lot or garage shall be no wider than 22 feet.**

Applicant’s Justification: The applicant provided the following summarized justification in response to this requirement:

“The drive aisles are more than 22 feet wide. All drive aisles are large enough to provide safe, efficient and convenient circulation and loading within the site... The parking has been placed along the southern and eastern boundaries and generally in close proximity to the entrance of the store. This ensures a safe circulation pattern and open – relatively unobstructed – views from the building out onto the property frontage. The design of the access to off-street parking also ensures that the requisite delivery truck has minimal impacts to the primary and secondary streets, while also ensuring safe on-site circulation and movement.”

The site plan shows drive aisles that are 24 feet wide. The applicant cites the need for the additional width to provide safe circulation for passenger and delivery vehicles. In general, 22 feet is the standard considered appropriate for safe vehicular internal circulation. At the October 20, 2016 Planning Board public hearing, the City of College Park requested that the applicant revise the DSP to show the parking lot drive aisle closest to US 1 to be one-way in and extend the parking lot island accordingly. By limiting the movement of the vehicles on-site, the applicant’s requested drive aisle width of 24 feet wide better accommodates the safe internal circulation of vehicles and pedestrians in this otherwise compact development. Further, the City supported the applicant’s amendment to provide 24-foot-wide drive aisles. For these reasons, the Planning Board supports the amendment request. The applicant shall provide a striped crosswalk at the US 1 access driveway, subject to approval of the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA).

(9) **Building Form/Parking Lots, Loading and Service Areas (page 242)**
Parking Lot Landscaping Requirements

- **Landscape islands may be used in lieu of landscape strips. No more than six consecutive parking stalls are permitted without a landscape island at least six feet wide and extending the entire depth of the parking stall. A minimum of one tree shall be planted in each landscape island.**

Applicant's Justification: The applicant provided the following summarized justification in response to this requirement:

“As designed, landscape islands that otherwise comply with the design standards are provided, on average, every 10 stalls, which adheres to the Landscape Manual. Thus, a modification to the strict application of this standard is requested. The applicant contends that its detailed site plan, despite this or any modification requested herein, is designed to preserve, create, or emphasize views from the public roads and the adjoining property. Again, the proposed building has been designed to provide a modern, clean and strong street presence along both US 1 and Berwyn Road... The applicant has prepared a Landscape Plan showing the proposed landscaping associated with the development. A screen wall is proposed along the frontage of US 1 and Berwyn Road to provide screening for the parking lot, as allowed for in the Sector Plan. This design promotes pedestrian connectivity, while not sacrificing the needed visibility of the site to the traveling public and/or without jeopardizing the health, safety, and general welfare of the public due to on-site constraints that other designs would create. The site layout also adheres to acceptable CPTED practices. Given that the design otherwise complies with the Landscape Manual and the requested modification is fairly limited in scope, the applicant contends that it is warranted in this instance.”

The above requirement for landscaping the interior parking area is intended to minimize the heat-island effect of the paved impervious surface rather than enhance screening as the applicant contends. The requirement also exists to reduce impervious surface and increase infiltration and control of stormwater runoff. Strict compliance with this standard will most likely result in fewer parking spaces than currently proposed. At the Planning Board hearing, the applicant indicated that a further reduction in parking could negatively impact the nearby Berwyn residential community, as sufficient parking on-site is a significant consideration to ensure that cars do not park within the community. In addition, and despite the number of additional improvements proffered by the applicant, including a plaza feature and more sidewalks, the DSP results in a reduction of existing impervious area. The applicant is also exceeding the tree canopy coverage requirement. Thus, the Planning Board finds that the applicant's amendment will not substantially impair the sector plan.

(10) **Architectural Elements/Façades and Shopfronts** (page 246)

- **The ground floor along the building frontage shall have untinted transparent storefront windows and doors covering between 50 percent and 70 percent of the wall area (between the finished floors).**

Applicant’s Justification: The applicant provided the following summarized justification in response to this requirement:

“As proposed, the building and the building entrance – with approximately over 90% glazed – provides clear views in and out of the store, which not only provides natural surveillance, but also creates activity at street level, as opposed to a monolithic and uninviting atmosphere.”

Because the provision of the windows is integral to the design of the building, the Planning Board supports the amendment request.

(11) **Architectural Elements/Façades and Shopfronts** (page 246)

- **The top of the storefront window sills shall be between one and three feet above the sidewalk grade.**

Applicant’s Justification: No justification was provided by the applicant.

The applicant is requesting an amendment to allow the glass and windows to extend to sidewalk grade. The Planning Board finds this to be a minor request and, therefore, supports the amendment.

(12) **Architectural Elements/Façades and Shopfronts** (page 246)

- **Doors or entrances for public access shall be provide at intervals no greater than 50 feet.**

Applicant’s Justification: The applicant provided the following summarized justification in response to this requirement:

“Generally, the applicant’s proposal satisfies the requirements for façades and shop fronts, with the exception of the requirement that doors or entrances be provided at intervals no greater than 50 feet. Given the use of the property includes a single building and not multiple buildings with multiple uses, it is debatable whether the door or entry standard is even applicable. That said, the applicant contends that the building design with the main entrance to the building occupying the most prominent corner of the building, the soaring

full height glass enclosed entry vestibule satisfies the purpose or intent of requiring opening no more than 50 feet apart.

“The entry feature provides an appropriate termination to the fully glazed façade and facilitates the transition to the façade configuration of the side of the building.”

Because the proposed building is for a single use, the Planning Board finds the single entrance feature, as proposed, to be adequate and, therefore, supports the amendment request.

(13) **Architectural Elements/Awnings, Galleries, and Arcades** (page 247)

- **Minimum awning depth= 5 feet (measured perpendicular to the wall face)**
- **Minimum under side clearance= 8 feet from the sidewalk.**
- **Awnings may occur forward of the minimum setback and may encroach within the right-of-way with the approval of the pertinent agency but shall not extend closer to the curb line than two feet.**
- **Awnings shall be made of durable fabric and may be either fixed or retractable. High-gloss or plasticized fabrics are**

The applicant has requested an amendment from the design standards for awnings, where they are provided. Because no awnings are proposed, the correct amendment from the requirement that awnings be provided is found below.

(14) **Architectural Elements/Brick Detailing** (page 252)
Headers

- **All openings in masonry construction should be spanned by headers.**

This requirement is not mandatory and, therefore, no amendment is required.

(15) **Architectural Elements/Signage** (pages 254)
Commercial Signs

- **Signs shall be externally lit from the front with a full-spectrum source. Internal and back lighting are permitted as an exception only for individual letters or numbers, such as for “channel letter” signage (panelized back lighting and box lighting fixtures are prohibited). Signage within a shopfront may be neon lit.**

Applicant’s Justification: The applicant provided the following summarized justification in response to this requirement:

“...[T]he signage proposed generally adheres to the development standards, with the exception that the signs are internally illuminated and the applicant is requesting a monument sign. All other standards are met. Keeping with the theme that Lidl is new to the United States and is not only creating a new brand, but also intending to create a new way Americans shop for groceries, it is critically important that its building and signage be visible and recognizable. To that end, internally illuminated signage, which is not overdone, as there are only two (2) logo signs on the east and south façades, respectively, will ensure the signage is visible while not impairing the implementation of the Sector Plan. The applicant contends, however, that its development – with its unique and iconic building design – would negatively be impacted if the building mounted signage was required to be externally illuminated. The look of having external goose-neck style lighting at almost 30 feet in the air on the corner feature of the building would result in a design that is detrimental to the overall look of the building. While it may be true, generally speaking, that externally lit signs for ground level commercial/retails uses are appropriate, in this instance, where the building design is designed at a scale to create a presence along the US 1 corridor (by being almost 30 feet tall), the applicant believes that strict application to this design standard will result in a substandard and aesthetically unattractive design.”

The Planning Board finds that the request will not substantially impair the sector plan and, therefore, supports the amendment request.

(16) **Architectural Elements/Signage** (page 255)
Not Permitted

- **Monument signs reflect a more suburban environment**

Applicant’s Justification: The applicant provided the following summarized justification in response to this requirement:

“The applicant is proposing an 8 foot tall monument sign on the south side of driveway entrance off of US 1. The sign design is attractive and mirrors the roof line of the building with a gently curving asymmetric top that frames the sign. The monument sign is not overdone and subtle while performing a critical function, as most consumers identify entrances and access points with signage. The Sector Plan’s prohibition on monument signs is based on the contention that “monument signs reflect a more suburban environment.” Despite this, the applicant contends that given that the property is adjacent to and across from established residential units; the property offers a unique ability to blend urban design with suburban environs. The design elements and features of this detailed site plan balance the surrounding environment (which are generally suburban – especially to the east) with the urbanization required by the Sector Plan. This is

particularly true given that the property is located in both the Corridor Infill and “Existing Residential Character Areas. In so balancing the various design guidelines with the generally residential character of the area (mainly to the east), which the applicant believes it has satisfactorily accomplished, a monument sign will not impair the implementation of the Sector Plan. In addition, and as indicated previously, in creating a brand for the very first time, the applicant does not have the luxury that all other commercial retailers have, which is name/logo recognition. Consequently, it is critically important that the applicant provide signage that is visible, recognizable, and attracts patrons/customers. Thus, internally illuminated logo signage at the top of the building at the entrance will capture the motorists traveling on US 1, and more pedestrian friendly signage in the form of a monument sign will attract pedestrians, bicyclists, and the residents in the Berwyn neighborhood. Given the totality of all of the circumstances, the applicant believes that its detailed site plan will not only benefit its development and the Development District, but will not substantially impair implementation of the Sector Plan.”

The applicant argues that because a suburban residential neighborhood exists to the east, that an expressly suburban element such as a monument sign along the US 1 frontage is appropriate. The location of the proposed monument sign is in the pedestrian realm of a major corridor in a walkable urban environment, where continued reliance on automobiles is discouraged in favor of other modes of transportation. The monument sign serves a single tenant, and is proposed to be eight feet in height with a sign area of 24 square feet. Clearly, the monument sign is meant to provide an additional visual cue to motorists and is not a pedestrian amenity. The Planning Board finds that the distinctive building architecture in a highly-visible location along a main corridor, in conjunction with building-mounted signage, provides sufficient visual reference for the use and, therefore, the amendment request for the monument is not supported.

(17) **Sustainability and the Environment/Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Certification** (page 256)

Because the proposed development is not within a walkable node, the requirement for minimum silver certification does not apply and, therefore, an amendment is not required. The applicant has, however, provided a list of LEED sustainable features and green building techniques to be employed in this project as follows:

- Infill development that takes advantage of existing infrastructure and the site location to basic community services including public transportation;
- Implementation of erosion and sediment control plans;
- Implementation of environmental site design techniques in the form of micro-bioretentention facilities for stormwater management;
- Reduced number of parking spaces provided;

- Possible use of high efficiency fixtures to reduce water usage;
- Heating Ventilating and Air Conditioning (HVAC) system will have a Seasonal Energy Efficiency Ratio (SEER) 13+;
- Exterior building materials will be glass, brick and stucco panels as opposed to vinyl siding;
- Collection of recyclables;
- Low VOC (Volatile Organic Compounds) materials (i.e., adhesives, sealants and carpet);
- Upgraded thermal insulation;
- Low E glazing and upgraded performance windows;
- Light Emitting Diode (LED) EcoForm Lighting; and
- Landscaping to add shade, ornamental, and evergreen trees, and
- Parking for electric cars and charging stations.

(18) **Sustainability and the Environment/Passive Solar and Ventilation Design**
(page 256)

- **Provide shade for south-facing façades by designing properly-sized overhangs on south facing glazing. Mature trees can also fulfill the need for shade on south facing façades.**

Applicant's Justification: The applicant did not provide a justification.

The building elevations show that a slight overhang is provided over a narrow band of windows along the top of the south facing façade. Because the intent of the standard is to shade larger storefront windows, particularly at street level, the Planning Board supports the requested amendment.

(19) **Sustainability and the Environment/Water Efficiency and Recharge**
(page 257)

- **All at-grade walks (excluding public sidewalks) and pathways shall be constructed with pervious materials.**

Applicant's Justification: The applicant provided the following justification:

“[The] use of permeable materials at private at-grade walks is infeasible due to outfall concerns.”

The Planning Board concurs that, due to inadequate soils, permeable pavers are not feasible on this site. The Planning Board further finds that approval of the amendment request will not substantially impair the Approved Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and, therefore, supports the applicant's request.

b. Additional amendments required, but not requested by the applicant:

(20) **Building Form, Character Area 4, Corridor Infill** (page 233)

- **Uncovered parking spaces may be provided within the third layer or setback at least 20 feet from the BTL.**

The applicant proposes uncovered parking spaces within the front build-to zone. The grocery store use, in conjunction with specific site design challenges and security concerns makes compliance with this requirement impractical. Therefore, the Planning Board supports the amendment request.

(21) **Building Form/Private Frontages** (page 236)
Shopfront

- **A frontage wherein the façade is aligned close to the frontage line with the building entrance at sidewalk grade. This type is conventional for retail use. It has a substantial glazing on the sidewalk level and an awning that should overlap the sidewalk to within two feet of the curb.**

Because of the unique building design proposed an awning is not practical, nor would the building façade be enhanced by such a feature if it were provided. The Planning Board finds that approval of the amendment would not substantially impair the sector plan.

8. **Zoning Ordinance:** The DSP application has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements of the Mixed-Use-Infill (M-U-I) Zone, the Development District Overlay (D-D-O) Zone, and site design guidelines of the Zoning Ordinance:

a. The general purpose of the M-U-I Zone is to encourage a mix of residential and commercial uses as infill development in areas which are already substantially developed, where recommended in an applicable plan, as in the 2010 Approved Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and SMA.

Section 27-546.19, site plans for mixed uses provides findings for those cases where more than one use is proposed on a single lot. In this case, a single use is proposed for Lot 27. Nonetheless, the site plan is in conformance with the required findings subject to approval of the requested amendments to the applicable development district standards. In addition, the application is in conformance with the compatibility standards and practices that minimize adverse impacts to, and encourage compatibility with, adjoining properties and the surrounding neighborhood.

- b. Section 27-548.25(b) of the Zoning Ordinance requires that the Planning Board will find that the site plan meets applicable development district standards in order to approve a detailed site plan. As discussed in Finding 7, this DSP complies with applicable D-D-O Zone standards with the exception of the 18 standards for which amendments are requested. The Planning Board supports approval of 17 of the requested alternative development standards because they will benefit the development and the district, and will not substantially impair the implementation of the Approved Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and SMA.
 - c. The applicant has proposed a site plan in accordance with Section 27-283, site design guidelines, of the Zoning Ordinance that further cross-references the same guidelines as stated in Section 27-274, specifically in regard to parking, loading, internal circulation, service areas, and lighting. Landscaping, where not provided for in the sector plan, has been provided in accordance with the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* (Landscape Manual) requirements.
9. **Prince George's County Landscape Manual:** Per page 226 of the Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and SMA, if a development standard is not covered in the plan area D-D-O Zone, the applicable sections of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* (Landscape Manual) shall serve as the requirement. The provisions of the Landscape Manual regarding Requirements for Landscape Strips Along Streets (Section 4.2), Parking Lot Requirements (Section 4.3), and Buffering Incompatible Uses (Section 4.7) are superseded by requirements of the D-D-O Zone standards in the sector plan. The landscape plan schedules for Sections 4.2, 4.3, and 4.7 are provided for informational purposes only. The DSP is subject to the requirements for Section 4.4, Screening Requirements and Section 4.9, Sustainable Landscaping Requirements of the Landscape Manual.
- a. Section 4.4 requires that loading and maintenance areas be screened from residential properties and street, that trash facilities be completely concealed, and that all mechanical equipment be screened from adjacent properties, streets and parking facilities.

The applicant is providing a trash enclosure for the proposed dumpsters and is screening rooftop mechanical equipment in conformance with these requirements.

- b. The site is subject to Section 4.9 which requires that a percentage of the proposed plant materials be native plants. A schedule demonstrating conformance with the requirement has been provided. It is noted that the 4.9 schedule indicates eight ornamental trees are credited as minor shade trees. The schedule should be revised to provide the eight ornamental trees in the correct category.

10. **Prince George’s County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance:** The site is exempt from the provisions of the Prince George’s County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance (WCO), because the property has less than 10,000 square feet of woodlands on-site and no previously approved Tree Conservation Plan. This site has an approved Standard Woodland Conservation Exemption (S-073-16) that expires on April 14, 2018.

11. **The Prince George’s County Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance:** The DSP is subject to the requirements of the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance. Section 25-128 of the Prince George’s County Code requires a minimum percentage of tree canopy coverage (TCC) on properties requiring a grading permit. Properties zoned M-U-I are required to provide a minimum of ten percent of the gross tract area in tree canopy coverage.

	REQUIRED	PROPOSED
Tree Canopy	14,375 sq. ft.	15,905 sq. ft.

The overall development has a gross tract area of 3.34 acres and, as such, a TCC of 0.33 acre, or 14,375 square feet, is required. The submitted landscape plan provides a worksheet indicating that this requirement will be addressed through the proposed planting of 60 deciduous major shade trees, 8 minor shade trees, and 15 small evergreen trees on-site, for a total of 83 trees and 15,905 square feet of provided TCC. The eight minor shade trees should be credited as ornamental trees, which results in a reduction of 50 TCC credits, but the total area covered in tree canopy will still meet TCC requirements. The worksheet should also be signed and dated by a licensed landscape architect.

12. **Further Planning Board Findings and Comments from Other Entities:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:

a. **Community Planning—**

- (1) This application is located within a designated Employment Area growth policy area. Plan 2035 describes Employment Areas as areas commanding the highest concentrations of economic activity in four targeted industry clusters and recommends continuing to support business growth in these areas, concentrating new business development near transit, where possible, improving transportation access and connectivity, and creating opportunities for synergies. The Plan 2035 Strategic Investment Program places this property in a designated priority investment area-the Innovation Corridor. Plan Prince George’s 2035 describes the

Innovation Corridor as the area that has the highest concentrations of economic activity in our four targeted industry clusters and the greatest potential to catalyze future job growth, research, and innovation in the near- to mid-term. This Innovation Corridor is well positioned to capitalize on the synergies that derive from businesses, research institutions, and incubators locating in close proximity to one another and on existing and planned transportation investment, such as the Purple Line.

- (2) The proposed land use is generally consistent with the Future Land Use element of the 2010 Approved Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan. The subject property is located in the Corridor Infill Character Area. 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 corridor infill character area consists of mixed-use, but primarily residential, development with easy accessibility to goods and services, and is intended to facilitate the redevelopment of existing strip-commercial development along US 1 while serving as a transition from the more intensive walkable nodes to existing residential areas adjacent to the corridor. The proposed use is permitted in the D-D-O/M-U-I Zone and is consistent with the sector plan's approved land use map. The land use policies and strategies of this sector plan are implemented through enforcement of a Development District Overlay Zone.

- (3) This application is located under the traffic pattern for a small general aviation airport (College Park Airport). This area is subject to Aviation Policy Area regulations adopted by CB-51-2002 (DR-2) as Sections 27-548.32 through 27-548.48 of the Zoning Ordinance. Specifically, the subject property is located in Aviation Policy Area (APA) 6. The APA regulations contain additional height requirements in Section 27-548.42 and purchaser notification requirements for property sales in Section 27-548.43 that are relevant to evaluation of this application. The proposed development is considerably lower than the height limit for APA conformance. The property is not proposed for reclassification into the Military Installation Overlay (M-I-O) Zone.

Proposed Amendments to the Development District Standards

Land Use and Urban Design Policy 2 of the Central US 1 Sector Plan articulates a key expression of the community's vision for the Corridor Infill Character Area: "[D]evelop a more residential character in the corridor infill areas with park-like landscaping, easy accessibility to nearby goods and services, and redevelopment of the existing strip-commercial character of US 1." The proposed use, a permitted mid-size food and beverage store, illustrates the challenge of providing easy accessibility to nearby goods

and services while redeveloping the existing strip-commercial character of US 1. To the extent the proposed building fronts on and addresses the street, it provides the requisite pedestrian-oriented and urban scale desired for this section of US 1. Other elements of the proposed site plan contain features of typical suburban strip development that is no longer desired by this community as expressed through its approved sector plan. The nature of the proposed use itself, which often involves the purchase and transport of large quantities of goods, encourages automobile use. How best to accommodate customers who must use a vehicle in an environment designed to be pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly, is a key issue facing this application.

Building Form and Site Layout

Many food and beverage stores within walkable urban environments contain structured or below-grade parking. However, the size of the proposed development makes structured or below-grade parking prohibitively expensive. With no such parking offered, the size of the building, the size and trapezoidal shape of the lot, and the parking requirements of this overlay zone, require a considerable portion of the site to be designated for surface parking. This inhibits the ability of the applicant to meet several building form requirements, necessitating several amendments to the Development District Standards as follows:

- (1) **Building Form, Character Area 4: Corridor Infill:** The applicant requests an amendment of the secondary build-to-line of 10-20 feet from Berwyn Road (page 233). The application shows a large surface parking lot as the secondary frontage.
- (2) **Building Form, Character Area 4: Corridor Infill:** The applicant requests an amendment of the requirement of 60 percent minimum frontage build out at the build-to-line (page 233).
- (3) **Building Form, Character Area 4: Corridor Infill:** The applicant proposes uncovered parking spaces within the front build-to zone. The Corridor Infill Parking Placement Standard states “Uncovered parking spaces may be provided within the third layer or setback at least 20 feet from the BTL.”

The clear intent of the sector plan and the development district standards is that the proposed corner entrance of this building should be located at the corner of (US 1) Baltimore Avenue and Berwyn Road, with parking beneath, above, or behind the structure or at the north end of the subject property opposite the entrance. However, several factors make strict conformance with this standard challenging:

- Compared to other retail uses, the proposed food and beverage store involves the transportation of relatively large quantities of goods from the store to customer vehicles. A site layout that requires considerable distances between the store entrance and on-site, off-street parking does not work as well for the proposed use as the applicant's proposed layout.
- The size of the store and its required parking in relation to the size and shape of the site limit building and site layout options.
- A store entrance directly onto a US 1 sidewalk is required.
- The size of the proposed use, coupled with the parking requirements as amended and the size and shape of the site, makes structured parking potentially cost-infeasible.
- It would be extremely difficult for the proposed use to meet the 50 to 70 percent shop front fenestration requirements (pages 245–246) by rotating the building so that a longer side of the proposed building fronts on US 1 in an attempt to increase the frontage percentage.
- The wording of the Corridor Infill Parking Placement standard on page 233 contains an error: the clear intent is that uncovered parking spaces may only be provided within the third layer or setback at least 20 feet from the build-to-line. However, the standard says “may;” omitting the phrase “may only” renders this standard a guideline, which this applicant cannot meet without further reducing parking.

Accordingly, the Planning Board supports these proposed amendments.

Height

- (4) **Building Form, Character Area 4: Corridor Infill:** The applicant requests an amendment of the principal building height requirement of two to four stories (page 233).
- (5) **Building Form, Character Area 4: Corridor Infill:** The applicant requests an amendment of the maximum first-floor height of 25 feet (page 233).

As the height of the proposed single-story building will vary from approximately 15 to 28 feet along the US 1 frontage and, as this provides the desired street wall appropriate for a walkable urban environment, the Planning Board supports both of these proposed amendments.

Awnings

- (6) **Form, Private Frontages:** Page 236 of the D-D-O Zone provides the different acceptable arrangements of the private frontage along the primary frontage street. Included in these Development District Standards is a defined Shopfront arrangement, which is marked by a building entrance at sidewalk grade, substantial glazing, on the sidewalk level, and an awning.

The applicant is not providing an awning and is proposing an amendment to the awning requirement on page 236. The Planning Board supports this amendment.

Parking

- (8) **Building Form, Parking:** The applicant requests an amendment to the requirement of four parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of retail development, which is an estimated 145 parking spaces (page 239). The applicant proposes 133 spaces.
- (9) **Building Form, Parking:** The application acknowledges that the required one bicycle parking space for every three vehicular parking spaces (page 239) is equivalent to 46 bicycle parking spaces. Thirty-five spaces are provided. There is a bus stop in the frontage area, and given that any reduction in parking encourages alternate means of access to the proposed use, as preferred by the sector plan, the Planning Board supports the applicant's proposed amendment.

The Planning Board supports a reduction in the number of provided bicycle spaces since the applicant and the City of College Park agreed to provide a bikeshare station on or abutting the subject property. A total of 25 bicycle parking spaces and 10 bikeshare spaces are proposed.

Parking Access

- (10) **Building Form, Parking Access:** The applicant requests an amendment to the requirement that the primary source of access to off-street parking may only be the primary frontage street when neither alleys, secondary frontages, nor side streets are present. (page 241)

The subject property has an existing primary access point onto US 1 (Baltimore Avenue) that is shifted north in the subject application. The intersection of Berwyn Road and US 1 (Baltimore Avenue) is controlled by a signal and provides a safer opportunity for pedestrians to travel along US 1 without risking being hit by a vehicle. The Planning Board supports the amendment request.

- (11) **Building Form, Parking Access:** The applicant requests an amendment to the requirement that the vehicular access drive of a parking lot or garage be no wider than 22 feet.

The Planning Board finds that the requested 24-foot-wide drive aisles will not substantially impair the sector plan and supports the amendment request.

Parking Lot Landscape

- (12) **Building Form—Parking Lots, Loading, and Service Areas:** The applicant requests an amendment to the requirement that “no more than six consecutive parking stalls be permitted without a landscape island” (page 242).

This standard exists to reduce impervious surface and increase infiltration and control of stormwater runoff. The applicant has demonstrated that the proposed tree canopy coverage and reduction in impervious surface from what currently exists on-site will offset the requested reduction in landscaped parking islands.

Street Screens

- (13) **Building Form, Parking Lots, Loading, and Service Areas and Architectural Elements, Street Screens:** The Development District Standards require the provision of street screens between 3.5 and six feet tall to mask parking lots from the primary frontage street and the secondary frontage or side street (page 242).
- (14) **Architectural Elements, Street Screens:** Required street screens may include garden walls, fences, or hedges, built to certain specifications (page 250).

The purpose of this standard is to screen parking lots from frontage areas. The applicant is providing the required street screening. The revised plan shows a four-foot-high brick screen wall along US 1 and Berwyn Road. Landscaping is provided along 48th Avenue.

- (15) **Building Form, Parking Lots, Loading, and Service Areas:** “Loading and service areas shall not be visible from streets, except alleys.” (page 242)
- (16) **Building Form, Parking Lots, Loading, and Service Areas:** “Loading and service areas should be hidden from public view by street screens.”

The applicant has agreed to replace the proposed loading area railing with a screen panel. The applicant shall provide a detail of the screen panel on the DSP.

Architecture

- (17) **Architectural Elements, Façades and Shopfronts:** The applicant requests an amendment to the requirement that doors or entrances for public access shall be provided at intervals no greater than 50 feet (page 246).

Given the specialized nature of the proposed use, the Planning Board supports this amendment.

- (18) **Architectural Elements, Brick Detailing:** Applicant requests an amendment from the requirement that all openings in masonry construction should be spanned by headers. (page 252)

The Planning Board supports the proposed amendment, which is minor in nature and will not impair the sector plan.

Signage

- (19) **Architectural Elements, Signage:** The applicant requests an amendment from the prohibition on internally-lit box signs. (page 255)

The Planning Board agrees with the applicant that the signage should be visible and recognizable. Signs may be externally lit and still be visible and attractive. New development on the Central US 1 Corridor is required to meet urban design standards that promote a walkable urban environment. New development in the Central US 1 Corridor is designed to capture the pedestrian's attention, not a motorist. The distinctive architecture of the proposed building will capture the attention of both pedestrians and vehicle operators without the use of inappropriate signage catering to motorists. The location and size of the proposed façade mounted signage is appropriate and, therefore, the Planning Board supports the amendment request.

- (20) **Architectural Elements, Signage:** The applicant requests an amendment from the prohibitions on free-standing and monument signs. (page 255)

The applicant contends that, because a suburban residential neighborhood exists to the east, an expressly suburban element such as a monument sign on the US 1 frontage is appropriate. The location of the proposed monument sign is in the most urban of environments: the pedestrian realm along the main corridor in the middle of a growing walkable urban city, and the proposed size of the sign, eight feet, for a single-tenant building, is designed to attract the motorist and not designed as a pedestrian amenity. The Planning Board does not support this amendment request.

Sustainability

- (21) **Sustainability and the Environment, LEED Certification:** The applicant addresses, in its statement of justification, elements of the proposed development that “may satisfy various LEED checklist items” (statement of justification page 15)

The site plan should demonstrate as many of these features as possible. The applicant is encouraged to include features beyond the first four examples provided:

- Infill development that takes advantage of existing infrastructure and the site location to basic community services including public transportation;
- Implementation of erosion and sediment control plans;
- Implementation of environmental site design techniques in the form of micro-bioretenion facilities for stormwater management;
- Reduced number of parking spaces provided.

- (22) **Sustainability and the Environment, Passive Solar and Ventilation Design:** The applicant’s analysis of the Development District Standards states that a modification is requested from the requirement (page 256) that shade be provided for south-facing façades using an overhang or trees. The provided overhang suffices, therefore, an amendment is not required.

- (23) **Sustainability and the Environment, Landscaping:** Permanent irrigation systems shall only utilize captured rainwater and/or building graywater (with approved filtration systems). Potable water use shall not be permitted in permanent irrigation systems (pages 256–257). The applicant is not proposing a permanent irrigation system.

Streetscape

This application addresses the following development district standards:

- (24) **Public Improvements:** Within the Central US 1 Corridor Development District, the developer/property owner (including the developer and the applicant’s heirs, successors, and/or assignees) is required to construct and maintain all the streetscape improvements of the proposed development. (page 203)
- (25) **Streets and Open Spaces, Streetscape, Amenities, and Adequate Public Facilities:**

- At the time of development, the developer/property owner (including the developer and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees) is required to install sidewalks. (page 264)
 - Amenities, such as benches, bicycle racks, trash receptacles, water fountains, sculpture/artwork, game tables, moveable seating, public mailboxes, and bus shelters, shall be required for all development. (page 264)
 - Streetscape amenities shall be consistent in design within a development project and should be consistent within each distinct walkable node, corridor infill area, or existing residential neighborhood. (page 264)
 - All proposed streetscape amenities shall be indicated on detailed site plan submittals and shall include information of location, spacing, quantity, construction details, and method of illumination. (page 264)
- (26) **Streets and Open Spaces, Street Sections:** Sidewalks should be five-to-eight feet throughout the Corridor Infill area along US 1 between the Capital Beltway and College Avenue. (page 260)
- (27) **Streets and Open Spaces, Street Lighting:** Pedestrian-scaled fixtures shall be used on all streets. (page 266)
- Street lights shall be placed aligned with the street tree alignment line (generally between two and a half to four feet from the back of the curb). Placement of fixtures shall be coordinated with the organization of sidewalks, landscaping, street trees, building entries, driveways, and signage. (page 266)
 - The height of light fixtures shall be kept low (generally not taller than 15 feet) to promote a pedestrian scale to the public realm and to minimize light spill to adjoining properties. Light fixtures in the walkable node and corridor infill areas shall be closely spaced (generally not more than 30 feet on center) to provide appropriate levels of illumination. (page 266)
 - Consideration of security and pedestrian comfort shall be prioritized by increasing illumination low to the ground in public parking lots, at building entries, in public plazas, and at transit stops. (page 266)
 - Use Louis Poulsen Nyhavn lighting fixtures as selected by the City of College Park along any US 1 frontage. (page 266)

The application shows a proposed eight-foot sidewalk along US 1 and a proposed five-foot sidewalk along Berwyn Road. The application shows provision of a bus stop as required by DPW&T Standard 300.24. The site plan shows provision of the required streetscape along the building frontage, with concrete sidewalk and street trees elsewhere. Street lighting fixtures will be approved by the City of College Park.

The site plan should include the following:

- (1) All pedestrian areas along US 1 should be constructed with the same pavers shown for the building frontage, including the crosswalks across the proposed vehicular entrance.
- (2) The photometric plan should include the following:
 - (a) Light impact radii for pedestrian-scale lighting installed along all sidewalks at no greater distance than 30 feet on center.
 - (b) Clear demonstration that light fixtures intended to light walkways, sidewalks, and the entrance plaza are no higher than 15 feet from the ground.

The site plan should show increased illumination at the bus stop, which is anticipated to serve customers of the proposed business.

All relevant amendments are discussed in detail in Finding 7.

b. Transportation Planning—

- (1) Vehicular access to the site will be limited to a new full access driveway onto Berwyn Road and one limited access (right-in and right-out only) to US 1, just north of the US 1 and Berwyn Road intersection. The proposed limited access to US 1 is a relocation of an existing full access driveway to US 1 that serves the existing hotel use. The proposed location conforms to the most recent design plans prepared by the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) for this portion of US 1.
- (2) With regard to the proposed on-site circulation, there is potential for parked cars to back up onto the two-way drive aisle that leads to the proposed access drive way to and from US 1. The designation of these impacted spaces as vehicle charging stations is included as a condition of DSP approval.
- (3) US 1 is the subject of an active SHA planning and design project. The State plan is currently in final design for the section of US 1 between College Avenue and

University Boulevard (MD 193). Other sections of US 1, including the subject site frontage, which is north of MD 193 and south of the Capital Beltway (I-95/495), are in various phases of redesign. Design elements include sidewalk improvements, pedestrian safety, and bike lanes.

- (4) Site access to and from Berwyn Road is approximately 350 feet east of its intersection with US 1. Berwyn Road is two-lane undivided roadway which is owned and maintained by the City of College Park. In order to construct the recommended streetscape and pedestrian elements as required by the D-D-O along US 1, Berwyn Road, and 48th Avenue, the applicant and the City of College Park have agreed to place the required easements along these roadways. Other than the preferred easements, no additional right-of-way dedications or setbacks are required for US 1.
- (5) The required parking for the proposed 36,185-square-foot grocery store is 145 spaces. The plan proposes the provision of only 133 surface-parking spaces, or 12 spaces fewer than the number required by the development district standards. In addition to an amendment request for the required number of parking spaces, the applicant is proffering to provide three parking spaces with charging stations in addition to an adequate number of bicycle parking spaces.
- (6) The Approved Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan contains a number of recommendations and policies for exploring shorter vehicle trips to transit, including walking and biking. The walkability, complete streets, and urban design discussions in the sector plan identify the need for safe and adequate street crossings, as well as pedestrian and bike accommodations at intersections throughout the study area and especially in the downtown areas. To this end, the applicant should work closely with the City of College Park toward the implementation of a city-wide bikesharing program and installation of a bus shelter per City of College Park standards at a bus stop along US 1 that is in proximity to the subject site. Subject to these conditions, the proposed amendment for the on-site parking reduction is supportable.
- (7) With the application, the applicant submitted a comprehensive traffic analysis, dated May 27, 2016. A revised study dated August 31, 2016 along with a queuing analysis were referred to SHA, DPW&T, and the City of College Park for their review and comment. (see attachments)
- (8) The proposed development will generate a total of 123 AM and 367 PM vehicle trips during the peak hours, respectively. Per the "Transportation Review Guidelines, Part 1, 2012," forty percent of these trips are considered "pass-by" trips. Pass-by trips refer to traffic already on adjacent roads for other purposes and "passing by" that site. The amount of the pass-by trips, in conjunction with background peak-hour trips estimated to be generated by the existing 118-room

hotel (63 and 71 AM and PM peak-hour trips), results in a net increase of 11 AM and 149 PM peak-hour vehicle trips. The traffic impact study includes the calculated annual growth of one-half of one percent per year for six years, and the projected 1,503 AM and 2,856 PM peak-hour trips for 22 background development applications within the study area.

- (9) As required by the D-D-O Zone Standards to demonstrate adequacy, the table below shows the reported average critical lane volume (CLV) and level of service (LOS) under existing, background, and total traffic for the AM and PM peak periods for the US 1 corridor, between Campus Way/Paint Branch Parkway and Greenbelt Road. The designated corridor includes the signalized intersections of US 1 with Greenbelt Road (MD 430), Berwyn Road, Berwyn House Road/ University View Drive, Melbourne Place/ The Varsity, and Lakeland Road.

Study Period	Existing Traffic CLV / LOS	Background Traffic CLV / LOS	Total Traffic CLV / LOS
AM peak Period	924 / A	1,157 / C	1,158 / C
PM peak Period	1,043 / B	1,468 / E	1,500 / E

The minimum acceptable average CLV/LOS for this corridor segment, as specified by the adopted adequacy standards of the US 1 Plan is 1,600/E.

- (10) In response to operational issues raised during the review by SHA and College Park, the applicant's traffic consultant provided supplemental traffic information and queuing analysis for the two signalized intersections of US 1 with Berwyn Road and Greenbelt Road. The submitted information adequately demonstrates that projected traffic queues along the required approaches are, in every case, less than the available storage.
- (11) The sector plan recommends the establishment of a corridor-wide Transportation Demand Management (TDM) district and a self-sustaining Transportation Management Association (TMA) to manage it. At this time, the US 1 TDM district has not been established.

Transportation Conclusions

Based on the preceding findings, the Planning Board supports the requested amendment to reduce the required number of parking spaces by 12 spaces, and concludes that existing transportation facilities will be adequate, as required by the 2010 Approved Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan, to serve the proposed redevelopment of the site as shown on the submitted DSP, subject to the conditions included in the approval of this application.

c. **Trails—**

- (1) US 1 is the subject of a SHA planning and construction project that will reconstruct the road with landscaping, sidewalks, bike lanes, and planted medians in the vicinity of the application. It is anticipated that SHA will completely reconstruct the existing frontage and driveway access, improve it with sidewalks, amenities, and transit access features.
- (2) The Development District Standards require that four to eight-foot-wide sidewalks be constructed in the “Corridor Infill” area (page 263). The application proposes a range of sidewalk widths along US 1 from five feet to twenty feet. The sidewalks that are proposed on US 1 appear to be adequate for the proposed use and do not conflict with the applicable Development District Standards for the Corridor Infill area. The application also proposes a range of sidewalk widths on Berwyn Road, ranging from 5 feet to 20 feet in width. The sidewalks that are proposed on Berwyn Road appear to be adequate for the proposed use, and they do not conflict with the applicable Development District Standards. The property frontage on 48th Avenue is in the “Existing Residential” area described in the area master plan. The Development District Standards require that four to eight-foot-wide sidewalks be constructed in the Existing Residential area (page 263). The application proposes a five-foot-wide sidewalk on 48th Avenue. The sidewalk appears to be adequate for the proposed use, and it does not conflict with the applicable Development District Standards. The applicant proposes a five-foot-wide sidewalk along the north side of the building that connects to US 1 and 48th Avenue. This sidewalk does not front on a roadway. The proposed sidewalk appears to be adequate for the proposed use and does not conflict with the applicable Development District Standards.
- (3) The area master plan recommends that US 1 contain bike lanes. Bike lanes are planned for construction by SHA. Dedication for bicycle lanes on US 1 is not recommended at this time because SHA is utilizing existing rights-of-way as much as possible for their project. Berwyn Road is recommended to contain a shared use road facility for bicycles (page 140). At this time the US 1 bicycle lanes have not been constructed. It is recommended that the applicant provide funding to the City of College Park for the installation of one bicycle warning sign assembly (W11-1 sign over a “Share the Road” plaque W16-1) on Berwyn Road to warn motorists of the presence of bicyclists and to indicate that Berwyn Road is a master-planned bikeway.
- (4) The development district standards require that a minimum of one bicycle parking space be provided within the public or private frontage for every three vehicular parking spaces provided on site. Bicycle parking should be placed in highly-visible locations along the street or within a parking garage (page 239). The application proposes 133 vehicle parking spaces which translates to 44

required bicycle parking spaces. To meet this requirement, the application proposes 15 bicycle parking spaces located at the main entrance. These 15 spaces are associated with the Zagster Bike Share program. An additional 25-bicycle parking spaces are proposed along the US 1 frontage for a total of 40-bicycle parking spaces. All of the proposed bicycle parking spaces appear to be located in appropriate and highly visible areas. The total number of proposed spaces (40) is short of the requirement of 44 spaces. It is recommended that 44 total u-shaped bicycle parking spaces be provided on site. Bicycle parking spaces should be placed in a concrete base and be in a lighted area. Individual U-shaped bicycle parking racks can provide a bicycle parking space for two bicycles each. Details of the bicycle parking spaces should be provided on the detailed site plan prior to certification.

The applicant has requested an amendment from the total required amount of bicycle parking which is discussed above in Finding 7. The total number of required bicycle parking spaces is actually 49. Conditions regarding bike rack details and “Share the Road” signage funding are included in the approval of this application.

- d. **Subdivision Review**—The subject property is composed of Parcel 14, which has not been the subject of a preliminary plan of subdivision or record plat, and is a legal acreage parcel. The property is located on Tax Map 33 in Grid D-1, and is approximately 3.296 acres. The property is currently improved with 42,780 square feet of gross floor area (GFA) for a hotel use.

The purpose of the detailed site plan application is to raze the existing hotel structure and redevelop the property with the construction of a new 36,185-square-foot food and beverage store.

Based on the aerial photos provided on PGAtlas, the existing structure was built before 1991. Historical permit records demonstrate that use and occupancy permits were issued for the motel/hotel use with a restaurant as far back as 1964, (Permit 8461-U). The site is exempt from the requirement of filing a preliminary plan of subdivision pursuant to Section 24-107(c)(7)(D) of the Subdivision Regulations because a development of more than 5,000 square feet of gross floor area, which constitutes at least 10 percent of the total area of a site that is not subject to a Regulating Plan approved in accordance with Subtitle 27 of the County Code, has been constructed pursuant to a building permit issued on or before December 31, 1991.

The existing conditions plan should note the date that the original hotel was constructed on the site.

However, in order for the above preliminary plan exemption to remain valid, a building permit for the proposed structure should be approved prior to the razing of the existing hotel.

No dedication appears to be shown along Baltimore Avenue, and it appears that brick pavers and other improvements are proposed within the limits of the right-of-way. This application should be referred to the Transportation Planning Section for review and comment. Right-of-way dedication of 10 feet is shown along 48th Avenue and Berwyn Road. This dedication can be accomplished by deed or final plat, and is exempt from the requirement of filing a preliminary plan of subdivision pursuant to Section 24-107(c)(5) of the Subdivision Regulations. The limits of the right-of-way should be clearly delineated on the site plan. There are no other subdivision issues at this time.

- e. **Permit Review**—Permit review comments that are relevant to the DSP have either been addressed in revisions or included as conditions in the approval of this application.
- f. **Environmental Planning**—
 - (1) The project is subject to the current regulations of Subtitle 24 and 25 that came into effect on September 1, 2010 and February 1, 2012 because the application is for the demolition of an existing hotel and the construction of a new grocery store. Although the site has a previous detailed site plan (DSP-07079) approved prior to September 1, 2010 and would normally be grandfathered to the current regulations of Subtitle 24 and 25, this case is considered new construction for an unrelated development project that was approved with the prior detailed site plan.
 - (2) The site is exempt from the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance (WCO), because the property has less than 10,000 square feet of woodlands on-site and no previously approved Tree Conservation Plan. This site has an approved Standard Woodland Conservation Exemption (S-073-16) that expires on April 14, 2018.
 - (3) There are no existing woodlands on-site. The site is relatively flat, and contains no woodlands. Most of the site drains into the Paint Branch Watershed that drains further into the Potomac River Basin. The northeastern corner of the site drains further into the Indian Creek Watershed that drains into the Patuxent River Basin. The predominant soils found to occur according to the US Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) Web Soil Survey (WSS) include Christiana-Downer-Urban land complex (5–15% slopes). According to available information, Marlboro clay does not occur on or in the vicinity of this property; however, Christiana complexes are mapped on-site. Based on information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Program there are no rare, threatened or endangered species found to occur in the vicinity of this site. There are no floodplains,

streams, Waters of the U.S., or wetlands associated with the site. No forest interior dwelling species (FIDS) or FIDS buffer are mapped on-site. The site does not have frontage with any roadways that are regulated for noise or that are considered historic or scenic roadways.

- (4) A stormwater management concept approval letter and associated plan were submitted with the application for this site. The approval was issued on June 7, 2016 with this project from the Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE), Site/Road Plan Review Division. No further action regarding stormwater management is required with this DSP review.
- (5) A lighting plan was submitted with this application. It appears that light pollution may extend offsite onto the rear of the existing condominium units on Parcel 14. The proposed lighting plan should be revised to eliminate any light pollution on the neighboring condominium units.

g. **Historic Preservation**—The subject application will have no impact on any historic sites, resources, districts, or known archeological sites.

h. **Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE)**—In a memorandum dated September 12, 2016, DPIE offered the following comments:

- (1) The property is located on the east side of Baltimore Avenue (US 1), in the northeast quadrant of its intersection with Berwyn Road. US 1 is a state-maintained roadway; therefore, coordination with the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) is required. Berwyn Road is maintained by the City of College Park; therefore, coordination with the City of College Park is required.
- (2) The proposed DSP is consistent with approved Site Development Concept Plan 15742-2016, dated June 7, 2016.
- (3) Exact acreage of impervious areas has not been provided. Stormwater volume computations have not been provided. Erosion/sediment control plans that contain the construction sequence, and any phasing necessary to limit earth disturbances and impacts to natural resources, and an overlay plan showing the types and locations of ESD devices and erosion and sediment control practices are not included in the submittal. These items are required at the time of filing for final site permits.

The applicant has been made aware of these comments.

- i. **Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA)**—In an e-mail received on July 14, 2016, SHA indicated all work in SHA right of way will require a SHA plan review and approval.
- j. **Prince George’s County Police Department**—The Police Department did not offer comments on the subject application.
- k. **Prince George’s County Health Department**—In a memorandum dated August 16, 2016, the Environmental Engineering Program of the Health Department offered the following comments and recommendations:
 - (1) The applicant must obtain the appropriate Raze Permit from the Prince George’s County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE) office to assure the proper abatement of any asbestos that may be present in the existing structure(s) on-site.
 - (2) The applicant must submit plans for the proposed food facility and apply to obtain a Health Department Food Service Facility permit through the Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE).
 - (3) This property is located in an area of the county considered a “food desert,” where healthy and affordable food is difficult to obtain. Within a one-half mile radius of this location, there are approximately five carry-out/convenience store food facilities, but no markets/grocery stores. Research has found that people who live near an abundance of fast-food restaurants and convenience stores compared to grocery stores and fresh produce vendors, have a significantly higher prevalence of obesity and diabetes. The proposed grocery store will provide high quality food options for consumers in the region.
 - (4) During the construction/demolition of this project, no dust should be allowed to cross over property lines and impact adjacent properties. Indicate intent to conform to construction activity dust control requirements as specified in the *2011 Maryland Standards and Specifications for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control*.

A condition is included that addresses this comment.
 - (5) No construction/demolition noise should be allowed to adversely impact activities on the adjacent properties. Indicate intent to conform to construction activity noise control requirements as specified in Subtitle 19 of the Prince George’s County Code.

A condition is included that addresses this comment.

- l. **Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)**—In an e-mail received on July 28, 2016, WSSC provided standard comments on this application regarding existing water and sewer systems in the area, along with requirements for service and connections, requirements for easements, spacing, work within easements, meters, etc. These issues must be addressed at time of permits for the site work.

The applicant has been made aware of these comments.

- m. **Washington Gas**—Washington Gas did not offer comments on the subject application.
 - n. **Verizon**—Verizon did not offer comments on the subject application.
 - o. **Potomac Electric Power Company (PEPCO)**—PEPCO did not offer comments on the subject application.
 - p. **Prince George’s County Fire/EMS Department**—The Fire/EMS Department did not provide comments on the application.
 - q. **City of College Park**—The City of College Park presented their position at the public hearing on October 20, 2016. Their requested conditions have been included in the approval of this application.
13. As required by Section 27-285(b)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance, the detailed site plan will, if approved with the conditions recommended below, represent 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.
 14. Per Section 27-285(b)(4) of the Zoning Ordinance, which became effective on September 1, 2010, a required finding for approval of a detailed site plan is as follows:

- (4) **The Planning Board may approve a Detailed Site Plan if it finds that the regulated environmental features have been preserved and/or restored in a natural state to the fullest extent possible in accordance with the requirements of Subtitle 24-130(b)(15).**

As there are no regulated environmental features found on the subject property, no preservation or restoration is necessary.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Subtitle 27 of the Prince George’s County Code, the Prince George’s County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission adopted the findings contained herein and APPROVED the Detailed Site Plan, DSP-07079-01, subject to the following conditions:

- A. APPROVED the following alternative development district standards:
(Note: The page numbers are referenced in the 2010 *Approved Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment*)
1. **Building Form, Character Area 4, Corridor Infill**—To allow a maximum building height of approximately 30 feet. (page 233)
 2. **Building Form, Character Area 4, Corridor Infill**—To allow the first building story to be a maximum of approximately 30 feet in height. (page 233)
 3. **Building Form, Character Area 4, Corridor Infill**—To allow 32 percent building frontage buildout. (page 233)
 4. **Building Form, Character Area 4, Corridor Infill**—To allow a secondary setback of 130 feet. (page 233)
 5. **Building Form/ Parking/Number of Spaces**—To allow 133 parking spaces or fewer if additional landscape parking islands are provided. (page 239)
 6. **Building Form/Parking**—To provide at least 25 bicycle parking spaces and a bikeshare program for at least 10 bicycles. (page 239)
 7. **Building Form/Parking Access**—To allow Baltimore Avenue (US 1) as a direct access to the proposed off-street parking. (page 241)
 8. **Architectural Elements/Façades and Shopfronts**—To allow 90 percent of the wall area to be windows and doors. (page 246)
 9. **Architectural Elements/Façades and Shopfronts**—To allow glass and windows to extend to sidewalk grade. (page 246)
 10. **Architectural Elements/Façades and Shopfronts**—To allow doors or entrances for public access to be provided at intervals greater than 50 feet. (page 246)
 11. **Architectural Elements/Signage**—To allow two building-mounted signs to be internally lit. (page 254)
 12. **Sustainability and the Environment/Passive Solar and Ventilation Design**—To allow the south building elevation to have only a slight overhang as proposed. (page 256)
 13. **Sustainability and the Environment/Water Efficiency and Recharge**—To allow the use of impervious paving materials for private, at-grade walks as proposed on the site plan. (page 257)

14. **Building Form, Character Area 4, Corridor Infill**—To allow uncovered parking spaces in the first layer within the front build-to-line. (page 233)
 15. **Building Form/Private Frontages**—To allow the building elevations as proposed, without an awning over the sidewalk. (page 236)
 16. **Building Form, Character Area 4, Corridor Infill**—To allow drive aisles that are 24 feet wide. (page 241)
 17. **Building Form/Parking Lots, Loading and Service Areas**—To waive the requirement that no more than six consecutive parking stalls are permitted without a landscape island at least six feet wide, extending the entire depth of the parking stall, with a minimum of one tree planted in each landscape island. (page 242)
- B. DISAPPROVED the following alternative district standard:
18. **Architectural Elements/Signage**—A monument sign. (page 255)
- C. APPROVED Detailed Site Plan DSP-07079-01, LIDL, College Park, subject to the following conditions:
1. Prior to certificate approval, the detailed site plan (DSP) shall be revised, or additional information shall be provided, as follows:
 - a. The DSP coversheet shall be revised to clarify the use as a “Food and Beverage Store” rather than “Commercial/Retail.”
 - b. The existing conditions plan shall note the date that the original use and occupancy permit was issued for the site.
 - c. The limits of the right-of-way shall be clearly delineated on the site plan.
 - d. The parking table shall be revised to provide the correct dimensions for the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) parking spaces (8 feet by 19 feet), and the site plan shall show sidewalk ramps.
 - e. The parallel loading spaces shall be clearly labeled and dimensioned on the site plan.

- f. Provide a general note as follows:
- “During the demolition/construction phases of this project, the applicant shall conform to construction activity dust control requirements as specified in the 2011 Maryland Standards and Specifications for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control, and the construction noise control requirements as specified in the Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR).”
- g. The color elevations shall be revised to include all dimensions, label all architectural elements, and identify all building materials for those elements.
- h. Manufacturer specifications for the plaza brick pavers, which also wrap around the front entrance to the building, shall be provided.
- i. Details for the U-shaped bike racks shall be provided.
- j. Color details of the signage shall be provided on the sign detail sheet that identify the sign material and clarify that the signs are internally lit.
- k. Subject to the City of College Park lighting standards (or details), the DSP and landscape plan shall be revised to show the number, placement, and height of pedestrian lighting along Baltimore Avenue (US 1). Streetlight fixture heights shall generally be no higher than 15 feet.
- l. The photometric plan shall show that no light trespass will impact the condominiums to the north.
- m. All lighting details shall clearly indicate the height of the specific poles proposed.
- n. The applicant shall designate three spaces adjacent to Baltimore Avenue (US 1) as vehicle charging stations for electric cars, with associated charging stations. These spaces shall be for electric cars only and will have signage. A detail of the signage shall be provided on the plan.
- o. Spot elevations for the retaining wall shall be shown on the site plan and a detail of the wall (elevation view) shall be provided.
- p. The height of the screen wall shall be shown on the site plan and a detail, including materials and elevation view, shall be provided.
- q. A striped crosswalk shall be provided at the Baltimore Avenue (US 1) access driveway, subject to Maryland State Highway Administration approval.

- r. The following revisions shall be made to the landscape plan:
 - (1) The Section 4.9 schedule shall be revised to provide the eight ornamental trees in the correct category.
 - (2) The eight minor shade trees shall be credited as ornamental trees on the Tree Canopy Coverage worksheet.
 - (3) The Tree Canopy Coverage worksheet shall be signed and dated by a licensed landscape architect.
 - (4) Add evergreen trees, such as American Holly and Eastern Red Cedar, to the landscape buffer along 48th Avenue. The evergreen trees shall be interspersed with the deciduous trees.
- s. Revise the Development District Standards Matrix to include the additional amendments required.
- t. The brick pavers shall extend to, and include, the sidewalk along the Baltimore Avenue (US 1) frontage.
- u. Decrease the width of the channelized driveways along Baltimore Avenue (US 1) to no more than 12 feet in width and provide ADA-compliant (Americans with Disabilities Act) striped crosswalks, subject to Maryland State Highway Administration approval.
- v. Show the parking lot drive aisle closest to Baltimore Avenue (US 1) to be one-way in, extend the parking lot island, and relocate the four parking spaces adjacent to US 1 eastward according to Applicant's Exhibit 1. Extend the brick wall and landscaping to screen these spaces.
- w. Provide a detail of the pedestrian light fixtures to be used on Berwyn Road and 48th Avenue. The Berwyn Road and 48th Avenue fixtures shall reflect a more residential character similar to the pedestrian light fixtures in the Berwyn Commercial District and not the Alumilite fixture shown on Sheet DSP-7 that will be used on Baltimore Avenue (US 1).
- x. Replace the open rail along the east side of the loading dock with opaque powder-coated aluminum panels. A detail of the panels shall be provided.
- y. Reinstall the ATHA wayfinding sign on Berwyn Road.
- z. Relocate the 10-space, five-bike, bikeshare station from the shopping cart corral area to the Berwyn Road plaza.

- aa. Provide improved, ADA-compliant (Americans with Disabilities Act) pedestrian ramps at the northeast and southeast quadrants of the Berwyn Road and Baltimore Avenue (US 1) intersection and provide an automatic pedestrian countdown signal for the east leg of Berwyn Road, subject to Maryland State Highway approval.
- 2. Total development within the subject property shall be limited to development which generates no more than 123 AM and 367 PM peak-hour vehicle trips.
- 3. Prior to issuance of any building permits for the subject property, the applicant shall:
 - a. Provide evidence that adequate easements as required by the Maryland State Highway Administration and/or the City of College Park have been established along the subject property frontages of Baltimore Avenue (US 1), Berwyn Road, and 48th Avenue.
 - b. Show the relocation of the bus stop, subject to Maryland State Highway Administration approval.
 - c. Contribute towards the City of College Park bikeshare program for Baltimore Avenue (US 1).

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that an appeal of the Planning Board's action must be filed with the District Council of Prince George's County within thirty (30) days following the final notice of the Planning Board's decision.

* * * * *

PGCPB No. 16-122
File No. DSP-07079-01
Page 41

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the action taken by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner Geraldo, seconded by Commissioner Bailey, with Commissioners Geraldo, Bailey, and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioner Washington absent at its regular meeting held on Thursday, October 20, 2016, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 10th day of November 2016.

Patricia Colihan Barney
Executive Director

By Jessica Jones
Planning Board Administrator

PCB:JJ:CF:rpg