Case No./Petitioner: PB 420 – Montevideo Crossing Royal Farms
Mark Levy, MIT-Montevideo, LLC

Request: For the Planning Board to approve the Optional Design Project (ODP) in a Commercial Redevelopment (CR) Overlay District for Royal Farms at Montevideo Crossing in accordance with Section 121.1.H of the Zoning Regulations.

Location: The property (Tax Map 43, Parcel 16, Lot/Parcel A, First Election District of Howard County, Maryland) is on Washington Boulevard between New Montevideo Road and Montevideo Road.

Recommendation: Approval subject to complying with Planning Board and ODP review comments.
Vicinal Properties: The property is surrounded by the following:

North – Washington Boulevard (Port Capital Commercial Center and Howard Square mixed use development located across Washington Boulevard).
East – Montevideo Road (Elite Spice Headquarters located across Montevideo Road).
South – Economic Roofing Company and other commercial companies.
West – New Montevideo Road (vacant forested commercial land located across new Montevideo Road).

Legal Notice: The property was properly posted and verified by DPZ.


History:

- WP-10-157, Alternative Compliance Petition – DPZ approved mass grading the site without a Site Development Plan (SDP), to remove specimen trees, and to defer Forest Conservation to the initial SDP.
- F-10-047, Subdivision Plat – To create Parcel A and to provide right-of-way dedication for Route 1 and new Montevideo Road.
- J-4206-1A & 1B, Capital Project – Montevideo Road will be relocated to align with Port Capital Drive. The traffic signal at existing Montevideo Road will be removed and the intersection will be right-in/right-out. Washington Boulevard will be widened and a median island constructed. Existing Montevideo Road will be renamed Old Montevideo Road and the realigned road will be Montevideo Road. This staff report refers to existing Montevideo Road as Montevideo Road and the realigned road as new Montevideo Road.
- F-16-079, Revision Plat – To revise the setbacks per the B-1-CR zoning district. The property was rezoned per the October 6, 2013, Comprehensive Zoning Plan.
- DAP#15-02, Design Advisory Panel – CVS Pharmacy (CVS) was presented to DAP on April 8, 2015.
- SDP-15-069, Site Development Plan – DPZ approved CVS on November 3, 2016. CVS is permitted as a matter of right in the B-1 zoning district and does not require an ODP. Royal Farms will share the site with CVS.
- DAP#16-06, Design Advisory Panel – Royal Farms was presented to DAP on March 23, 2016. See Exhibit A.

Site Analysis: Site Description – The site is 4.04 acres and is mass graded. Current access is from Montevideo Road.

Permitted Uses – Motor Vehicle Fueling Facilities are not permitted as a matter of right in the B-1 zoning district. The Optional CR overlay district allows an ODP for Motor Vehicle Fueling Facilities, if located on at least 3 acres and approved by the Planning Board.

Setbacks – Setbacks comply with the B-1 zoning district and are established with approval of the ODP; except the maximum building height, which is 65 feet.
**Site Improvements** – The proposed Royal Farms convenience store is 5,166 SF, orientated towards Washington Boulevard, in alignment with CVS; with motor vehicle multi-purpose dispensers (MPDs) located behind. 127 shared parking spaces are accessed from Montevideo Road and New Montevideo Road with two-way internal movement along the site’s perimeter and between buildings. Sidewalks with direct access to the site are proposed along new Montevideo Road and Washington Boulevard, with internal crossings to facilitate pedestrian movement. See Exhibit B.

**Environmental Considerations** – There are no floodplains, streams, wetlands or their buffers, or steep slopes.

**Landscaping** – Perimeter landscaping complies with Section 16.124 of the Howard County Code, Landscape Manual, and Route 1 Manual. DPZ approved an alternative compliance request to allow larger caliper street trees to be planted farther apart along Washington Boulevard.

**Stormwater Management (SWM)** – 10 and 100 year SWM will be treated on-site by privately maintained micro-bioretention facilities.

**Forest Conservation** – Forest Conservation was previously addressed by a fee-in-lieu payment with SDP-15-069.

**Adequate Road Facilities** – A Traffic Report was submitted with PB-420 and will be verified at SDP.

**Planning Board Criteria:** The proposed ODP will accomplish the purposes of the CR Overlay District.

1. **Redevelopment that benefits the surrounding residential and business areas by creating and enhancing well designed centers that help create a vibrant marketplace.**

   The site complies with the Route 1 Manual design standards and DAP recommendations for a well-designed center. Royal Farms will be accessed by two public roads and sidewalks from Washington Boulevard for easy access.

2. **The encouragement of the most favorable arrangement of building, parking, vehicle circulation, pedestrian circulation, public areas, landscaped areas and other site features based on the physical site characteristics and the character of the surrounding developments. This arrangement is subject to and required to meet the design standards of the Route 1 Manual.**

   The site complies with the Route 1 Manual design standards. The MPDs are located behind the Royal Farms convenience store to allow the building facade to align with CVS. Two-way, uninterrupted vehicular drives connect new Montevideo Road with Montevideo Road and internal movement is directed by traffic signs. Sidewalks provide pedestrian access mid-way along Washington Boulevard, in close proximity to the transit stop and on Montevideo Road perpendicular to CVS entrance. Tables are provided for an outdoor dining area and landscaping complies with applicable regulations.

3. **The provision of creative high-quality architectural and site design that minimizes isolated buildings or pad sites and presents a positive image along or near the U.S. Route 1 corridor.**

   Royal Farms altered their standard architecture to better match that of the CVS, thereby visually connecting the two buildings and creating a unified theme. Brick color will match, siding will match the top band of CVS’ exterior insulation and finishing system (EIFS), and white trim board will correspond with CVS’ peach colored EIFS. See Appendix C.
4. The development of a mixture of commercial land uses based on market conditions, the site characteristics, and the current or intended future character of the surrounding developments.

The site is surrounded by commercial, industrial, and mixed-use residential development. Market studies from major national and regional retail tenants indicate a need for the proposed uses.

5. The encouragement of projects which involve the assembly and redevelopment of the greatest number of adjoining properties, and the discouragement of smaller projects that obstruct the assembly and redevelopment of adjoining properties.

Three former parcels were merged to create the site and roadway dedication for new Montevideo Road. The proposed road will redirect traffic to a major intersection and provide public road frontage for future redevelopment.

**SRC Action:** The Subdivision Review Committee (SRC) determined the ODP can be approved.

**Recommendation:** DPZ recommends approval of the ODP (PB-420), subject to conditions imposed by the Planning Board.

Please note the file is available for public review by appointment at the Department of Planning and Zoning's public service counter, Monday through Thursday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. and Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.
Meeting Summary
March 23, 2016

Attendance
Panel Members: Don Taylor, Vice Chair
Phil Engelke
Bob Gorman
Sujit Mishra
Julie Wilson

DPZ Staff: Kristin O’Connor, Kate Bolinger, Lisa Kenney

Royal Farms Store #230 - #16-06
Owner: MIT-Montevideo, LLC
Developer: Royal Farms
Architect: Ratcliffe Architects
Engineer: Benchmark Engineering, Inc.

Oxford Square, Parcels Z & AA - #16-07
Owner/Developer: Kellogg-CCP, LLC
c/o David P. Scheffenacker, Jr.
Home Builder: Lennar Homes
Architect: Middleburg Architectural Service
Engineer: Fisher Collins and Carter, Inc.

1. Call to Order – DAP Vice Chair Don Taylor opened the meeting at 7:33 pm, calling for introductions of the Panel, staff and Project team.

2. Review of Royal Farms Store #230 – #16-06 – Mr. Dave Thompson, Benchmark Engineering, offered an overview of the proposed project. He described the proposal for a Royal Farms gas station canopy and store, to be located on half of a site that is also planned to include a CVS Pharmacy. Plans for the CVS project have already been reviewed by the DAP and the Department of Planning and Zoning, and Mr. Thompson stated that construction of the CVS could begin this summer.
In describing the site context, Mr. Thompson noted that Howard County has two capital projects planned adjacent to the project site. These projects include construction of a new public road immediately west of the site (the new Montevideo Road) to align with Port Capital Drive, and planned cross section improvements to Route 1. Plans call for a 6 foot sidewalk along the site's Route 1 frontage.

Vehicles will not access the site from Route 1, but rather from the new public road to the west and the existing Montevideo Road to the east. Vehicle access points are proposed at the rear of the site. He described how the Royal Farms store will feature two entrances, one from the building's front façade and one from the rear façade. Parking is proposed along each of the building's four facades.

Mr. Thompson stated that the landscaping would mimic landscaping planned for the adjacent CVS project. Evergreens are planned for the rear of the site for screening.

William Moltoff, Ratcliffe Architects, described the proposed materials as timeless and low maintenance. He stated that the colors of the brick, HardiePlank siding, and trim proposed for the Royal Farms store building were chosen to match the adjacent CVS building. Mr. Moltoff noted that the dumpster would be enclosed by a PVC fence. He described a proposed freestanding pylon sign that would be 25 feet high with a stone base, brick piers, and PVC columns. The gas canopy columns would feature stone surrounds.

DAP Vice Chair Don Taylor directed staff to present comments on the project. Ms. Kate Bolinger, DPZ, noted that the project proposes to use the Commercial Redevelopment (CR) Overlay District zone. The purpose statement in the CR Overlay District zoning code contains multiple references to design. Ms. Bolinger cited the purpose of the CR Overlay District as to promote:

1) Redevelopment that benefits surrounding residential and business areas by creating and enhancing well designed centers that help create a vibrant marketplace;

2) The encouragement of the most favorable arrangement of building, parking, vehicle circulation, pedestrian circulation, public areas, landscaped areas and other site features based on physical site characteristics and character of surrounding developments; this arrangement is subject to and required to meet the design standards of the Route 1 Manual;

3) The provision of creative high-quality architectural and site design that minimizes isolated buildings or pad sites and presents a positive image along or near the US Route 1 corridor;

4) The development of a mixture of commercial land uses based on market conditions, the site characteristics, and the current or intended future character of the surrounding developments; and

5) The encouragement of projects which involve the assembly and redevelopment of the greatest number of adjoining properties, and the discouragement of smaller projects that obstruct the assembly and redevelopment of adjoining properties.

Ms. Bolinger stated that in terms of canopy and building placement, the Route 1 Manual calls for clustering of buildings to create a uniform street edge. She noted that in the proposed plan, the gas canopy nearly aligns with the CVS building, but the Royal Farms store building is set back from the gas canopy by approximately 80 feet. Ms. Bolinger asked if there might be an opportunity to bring the store building closer to the canopy by reducing the drive aisle width between the canopy and building. She also asked if the canopy and store building could somehow be integrated or connected in order to give the impression of one structure.

Ms. Bolinger acknowledged that the applicant had responded to staff's request that plans show the location of the future sidewalk to be constructed along US 1 frontage by providing a revised plan to the DAP at the meeting. However, the revised site plan did not address staff's comment that a paved pedestrian walkway be provided from the US 1 frontage and future sidewalk to the property.

Staff requested that the applicant reconsider the design of the pylon sign to comply with the Route 1 Manual's recommendation for monument or low-profile, ground-mounted type signs over freestanding pole-mounted signs, and that the sign use materials that complement the proposed building as well as the CVS building and CVS sign. Ms. Bolinger acknowledged that in the applicant modified the sign to feature a complementary stone base and brick piers.
Ms. Bolinger noted that staff requested information on proposed screening method and materials for the dumpster, and that the applicant's presentation provided that information. The Route 1 Manual requires that dumpsters are enclosed with a continuous, solid, opaque wall or fence, or a Type D landscape screening treatment.

The final staff comment requested more information on types of plantings proposed, and Ms. Bolinger noted that the revised site plan included captions indicating plant materials.

DAP member Bob Gorman initiated discussion with the applicant, asking if customers could enter from the front and back of the store. Jeff Bainbridge, Royal Farms, confirmed that customers could use either entrance, but stated that most customers use the front entrance. Mr. Gorman asked if the locations of the gas canopy and the Royal Farms store building could be reversed in order to place the building along Route 1, aligning with the CVS building.

Mr. Bainbridge stated that historically, Royal Farms has placed the gas canopy in front because customers are looking for the canopy. He further suggested that should the Royal Farms building be located in the front, it could block views of the adjacent CVS.

Mr. Taylor expressed his support for Mr. Gorman's suggestion of flipping the gas canopy and building. He noted that the intent of the Route 1 Manual is to create a streetscape, and that the canopy is quite transparent. He suggested that pulling the building forward would solidify the streetscape. Mr. Taylor stated that the proposed building is not unattractive, and the public is familiar with Royal Farms, so the site may cater to the local customer base more than drivers passing through. He also noted that incoming vehicular traffic will enter at the back of the site.

Mr. Thompson indicated that the back façade of the Royal Farms building contains a glass double entry door, while the front façade features more glazing, allowing views of the gas pumps from the front. Mr. Bainbridge noted that all of the store equipment is towards the back of the store, precluding additional glazing along the back façade.

DAP member Julie Wilson stated her agreement with other Panel members' concerns regarding the canopy placement as proposed along Route 1. Ms. Wilson suggested an alternative layout in which the store building and canopy would be rotated 90 degrees. Mr. Thompson responded that the site is likely not large enough to accommodate this arrangement.

Mr. Bainbridge stated that they have designed the project to comply with the requirements in the Route 1 Manual in terms of matching the existing CVS materials and colors as much as possible. He stated that the proposed layout with the gas canopy in front is needed to market and run the business.

DAP member Sujit Mishra expressed his preference for a layout in which the canopy and store building are rotated 90 degrees. He noted that in the applicant's proposed site layout, the gas canopy is situated as a prominent corner feature.

Mr. Gorman noted that the Royal Farms faced is distinctive, and a different site layout would be convenient for customers as well as in compliance with staff recommendations.

Sang Oh, Esq., Talkin & Oh LLP, stated that the Route 1 Manual refers to three specific zones, and that when the CR zone was created, it only referenced the Route 1 Manual. Mr. Oh indicated that adding a gas station along Route 1 is challenging because in the past the use was not allowed.

Mr. Taylor explained that the role of the Panel is to improve design along the Route 1 corridor. Mr. Oh sought guidance on how the store could be designed if the proposed site layout were flipped. Mr. Taylor suggested that the front façade of the proposed store would be appropriate to face Route 1, but the gas pumps facing Route 1 would not be appropriate.
The DAP adopted the following recommendations for the project. These recommendations will be forwarded to the Planning Board for consideration during its project review.

DAP Vice Chair Don Taylor made the following motion:

1. "That the applicant seriously consider the relocation of the building to face directly on Route 1." Seconded by DAP member Phil Engelke.

Vote: 5-0 to approve.

DAP member Bob Gorman made the following motion:

2. "That the applicant consider complying with the staff recommendations for the pedestrian access off of the Route 1 sidewalk and the other staff recommendations." Seconded DAP Vice Chair Don Taylor.

Vote: 5-0 to approve.

For reference, the staff recommendations included the following:

Staff Comments - CR Overlay District Purpose
The applicant should describe how the proposal addresses the purpose of the CR Overlay District, specifically how the project promotes the following:

1. Redevelopment that benefits the surrounding residential and business areas by creating and enhancing well designed centers that help create a vibrant marketplace.
2. The encouragement of the most favorable arrangement of building, parking, vehicle circulation, pedestrian circulation, public areas, landscaped areas and other site features based on the physical site characteristics and the character of the surrounding developments. This arrangement is subject to and required to meet the design standards of the Route 1 Manual.
3. The provision of creative high-quality architectural and site design that minimizes isolated buildings or pad sites and presents a positive image along or near the U.S. Route 1 corridor.
4. The development of a mixture of commercial land uses based on market conditions, the site characteristics, and the current or intended future character of the surrounding developments.
5. The encouragement of projects which involve the assembly and redevelopment of the greatest number of adjoining properties, and the discouragement of smaller projects that obstruct the assembly and redevelopment of adjoining properties.

Staff Comments – Route 1 Manual

1. Canopy and building placement – the Route 1 Manual calls for clustering of buildings to create a uniform street edge (page 35). As proposed, the gas canopy nearly aligns with the CVS building, but the Royal Farms store building is set back from the gas canopy by ~80 feet. Is there an opportunity to bring the store building closer to the canopy by reducing the drive aisle width? Further, is there an opportunity to integrate or connect the canopy with the Royal Farms store building?

2. Sidewalk – plans should indicate the location of the future sidewalk to be constructed along the US 1 frontage. The Route 1 Manual requires 6 foot wide sidewalks along the US 1 frontage. Please refer to the sidewalk and crosswalks section of the Route 1 Manual (beginning on page 26).
3. Pedestrian connections – provide a paved pedestrian connection from the US 1 frontage and future sidewalk so that pedestrians have a second access point to the property. The Route 1 Manual requires a minimum internal pedestrian walkway width of 5 feet. The manual further requires that walkways connect public rights-of-way and bus stops to building entrances (page 45).

4. Pylon sign – the Route 1 Manual recommends monument or low-profile, ground-mounted type signs over freestanding pole-mounted signs (page 44). The applicant should reconsider the design of the pylon sign to comply with the recommendation. The monument sign could use materials that complement the proposed building as well as the CVS building and CVS sign.

5. Dumpster enclosure – please indicate proposed screening method and materials for the dumpster. The Route 1 Manual requires that dumpsters are enclosed with a continuous, solid, opaque wall or fence, or a Type D landscape screening treatment. Please refer to the trash enclosures section of the Route 1 Manual (page 42).

6. Landscape plan – please indicate the types of plantings proposed, including treatment of the bioretention areas to the northeast of the property. Please refer to the landscape section of the Route 1 Manual (beginning on page 40).

3. Review of Oxford Square, Parcels Z & AA – #16-07 – Mr. Matthew Fitzsimmons, Hord Coplan Macht, gave an overview of the entire Oxford Square project, indicating the project’s mix of uses, focal points, and amenity spaces. He stated that the current submission comprises parcels AA and Z, where townhouses are proposed. He described how both of these parcels slope toward a central green space (an existing wetland/natural area), and that the CSX rail line borders the parcels to the west. Mr. Fitzsimmons noted that because of the presence of the rail line, the site would require noise mitigation in the form of a sound wall.

Mr. Fitzsimmons described the organization of the townhouses, amenity spaces, pedestrian connections and streets. He noted that the townhouses are arranged to create small courts with views toward the central green space. He stated that a community-wide shared-use path continues through these parcels, running along one side of the central green space and then connecting to an adjacent school site. He indicated that the project would provide two new public streets with sidewalks. The sound wall would be located parallel to the new street ‘A,’ and both the sound wall and street would align with the CSX rail line.

The project aims to minimize the amount of retaining walls needed and address stormwater management with outdoor spaces. As a result, Mr. Fitzsimmons noted that an area previously slated for a small parking area was redesigned as open space with stormwater management functionality.

Mr. Josh Bundy, Lennar Homes, explained the intent in designing the townhouses was to create a smaller housing option (with 18 foot wide footprints) compared to other homes in Oxford Square, while maintaining continuity of design in brick and color choices. The smaller homes are intended to allow additional buyers entry to the community.

DAP Vice Chair Don Taylor recused himself from the discussion due to his working relationship with Lennar Homes. DAP member Phil Engelke took over as Chair. Mr. Engelke directed staff to present comments on the project. Ms. Kate Bolinger, DPZ, noted several staff comments related to elevations.

Regarding the rear elevations, staff sought additional information in terms of materials, door and window pattern, and garage doors. She requested confirmation from the applicant that the rear elevations would feature single-car width garage doors, and that each unit would feature a one-car wide parking pad. Mr. Bundy confirmed that each unit would feature a single-car garage and one-car parking pad.
Montevideo Crossing, CVS/Royal Farms
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