

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 December 6, 2001, regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-01036 for Manokeek, Lots 1-10 and Parcel A, the Planning Board finds:

1. Location: The subject property is located on the south side of Berry Road (MD 228) east of the intersection of Berry Road and Indian Head Highway (MD 210). The property is bounded to the south and east by Manning Road; to the north by the MD 210 right-of-way and vacant property zoned R-R; and to the east by the MD 228 right-of-way.
2. The Proposed Development: The purpose of this Detailed Site Plan is approval of ten (10) commercial/retail lots and one (1) parcel on 26.04 acres. The plan includes the building footprint locations, parking compound layout, vehicular and pedestrian circulation/access points, and proposed landscaping. The application also includes proposed architecture for the retail anchor store, Giant Food, and the adjoining retail components on either side of the Giant, all of which are on Lot 4. Proposed architecture for the surrounding pad sites has not yet been developed. Therefore, Condition 2 has been added in the Recommendation section of this report which requires approval of separate site plans with architecture by the Planning Board prior to release of any building permits for Lots 1, 2, 3 (designated for day care use), 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10. The application consists of Site and Landscape Plans, Type II Tree Conservation Plans, and an Illustrative Site Plan for the entire development, and proposed architecture for Lot 4. Access from MD 210 and MD 228 was denied for the subject property; therefore, ingress/egress will be via Manning Road.

The overall Manokeek development of which the subject application forms one part will encompass approximately 97 acres in the M-X-T Zone. The applicant's three proposed uses for the property are residential (senior/age-restricted dwellings), commercial/retail, and office. In its entirety, the proposed development will allow for 1,427,500 to 1,686,461 square feet of gross floor area. The proposed uses will be sited on Pods 1, 2, and 3. The proposed commercial/retail use will occupy Pod 1, and is the subject of the current application. Office space will occupy Pod 3, and Pod 2 will be occupied by the senior/age-restricted dwellings with a small allowance for service-oriented commercial/retail and office.

3. Background: The *Subregion V Master Plan and SMA* (1993) rezoned the subject property from E-I-A to the M-X-T Zone. Mixed-Use development was specifically recommended for the subject property.

On September 14, 1993, the District Council approved *The Subregion V Master Plan and SMA* and adopted Zoning Ordinance No. 60-1993 which rezoned the property to M-X-T. Zoning Ordinance No. 60-1993 does not contain any conditions or considerations with respect to the subject property. The proposed plan is in full conformance with Zoning Ordinance No. 60-1993.

The subject application and the proposed development raise no master plan issues.

1. The Approved Conceptual Site Plan : Conceptual Site Plan CSP-99050 for the subject property was approved by the Planning Board on July 27, 2000 (PGCPB No. 00-142).

The overall lotting pattern, circulation pattern and access points shown on the site plan are in general conformance with the approved Conceptual Site Plan, CSP-99050. Below are the specific conditions warranting discussion pertaining to conformance of the Detailed Site Plan to the approved Conceptual Site Plan:

1. **At the time of Detailed Site Plan, special attention shall be given, but shall not be limited to, the following:**
 - a. **The streetscape treatment of the subject property to include sidewalks, special pavers, interior landscaping at building frontages, lighting, furnishings, and sitting areas.**

Comment: Although the proposed plans do provide landscape plans which demonstrate conformance to the landscape plantings required by Section 27-274(a)(6) and 27-274(a)(5)(A), all required streetscape elements have not been determined at this time and thus were not presented for review. Therefore, a condition has been included in the Recommendation section of this report which requires that, prior to approval of Detailed Site Plans for Lots 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, the remaining specific details of the streetscape treatment, special/decorative pavers, planters,

furnishings, lighting, etc., shall be established through the provision of a separate Detailed Site Plan.

Furthermore, it is recommended prior to certificate approval that specific details of the streetscape treatment, special/decorative pavers, planters, furnishings, lighting, etc., for Lot 4 be provided.

- b. The designated focal point areas of the subject property to include human scale, urban design, materials, landscaping/screening, furnishings, and lighting.**

Comment: Although not submitted as part of the subject application, the applicant has stated that the proposed commercial/retail entity will provide at least one focal point area. Furthermore, the applicant has indicated that the area under consideration for the subject provision will be in proximity to the retail structure adjacent to the south corner of the Giant Food store. Staff believes that any designated focal area will be an integral component in the shopping center development, and accordingly its design/treatment should be reviewed at this time. Therefore, it is recommended that prior to certificate approval the designated focal point area should be submitted and reviewed as part of this application.

- a. The building materials and architecture.

Comment: The subject buildings as proposed by this plan, Giant Food and two adjoining structures, are single-story masonry structures, with facades that combine split-faced block, cement planking, Exterior Finish Insulation System (E.F.I.S.), and face-brick. The front facades of the proposed structures will be accented by towers at the ends,

between which staggered brick columns will project out from the face of the buildings to form a pedestrian arcade. The rear facades that face the proposed residential community, Manokeek, will be finished with split-face block, and will be buffered with extensive landscaping along the west property line along Manning Road East. The proposed retail building=s front facades will employ fabric awnings on metal frames between the columns which help reinforce the commercial arcade appearance throughout the development. The applicant has provided a material sample board which specifies all proposed exterior finishes and colors for the subject development. The anchor store of the development, Giant Food, will provide a viable commercial entity for the community.

Architecture for future structures within the development pod, pad sites, will be reviewed individually as submitted with their corresponding Detailed Site Plans.

- d. Perimeter landscaping/screening of all development pods shall exceed the requirements of Sections 4.3a and 4.2a, of the *Landscape Manual* in terms of width and plant quantities by no less than 100 percent.**

Comment: The subject development proposal does not appear to satisfy said condition with respect to the required plant quantities; therefore, it is recommended that the plans be revised prior to certificate approval to provide plant quantities that exceed the requirements of Sections 4.3a and 4.2a of the *Landscape Manual* by no less than 100 percent.

- e. Parking lot interior green proposed for development Pods 1 and 3 shall exceed the requirements of Section 4.3c of the *Landscape Manual* in terms of plant**

by no less than 25 percent.

Comment: The subject development proposal does not appear to satisfy said condition with respect to the required plant quantities; therefore, it is recommended that the plans be revised prior to certificate approval to provide plant quantities that exceed the requirements of Section 4.3c of the *Landscape Manual* by no less than 25 percent.

- a. Provision of a public amenity to be used by the surrounding community in development Pod 2.

Comment: Development Pod 2 is not part of the subject application.

- g. The maximum height of office structures shall be limited to a maximum of 3-4 stories. The maximum height of residential structures shall be limited to 5-6 stories.**

Comment: No office or residential structures are proposed on the subject property.

- h. The proposed signage for the commercial/retail components. A comprehensive design approach is recommended.**

Comment: The applicant has proposed three (3) sign types, two (2) freestanding and one (1) ground-mounted monumental entrance sign as part of the subject application. The Giant Food corporate logo/sign will be located on the food store front facade above the main entrance. The two freestanding signs will be identical in size, both measuring 25 feet high by 12 feet-4 inches wide and 2 feet-4 inches deep. The sign will be supported by two 18-inch-diameter pipe columns. The main sign panel for the Giant Food sign will be six feet-six inches high, and will provide the

food store corporate logo only. The shopping center freestanding sign will have two main sign panels, one measuring four feet-ten inches high, which provides the shopping center name, the other measuring four feet-six inches high, which will provide the Giant Food corporate logo. Beneath the two main sign panels and between the pipe columns will be three tenant sign boards which will measure two feet-six inches high by eight feet wide. The ground-mounted monumental entrance sign will measure seven feet-four inches high by ten feet wide, and will provide only the shopping center name. Staff believes that the proposed signage is appropriate for advertisement to motorists along the adjacent rights-of-way, and is consistent with regard to size, color, materials, and proportions. No other signage is proposed at this time; therefore, it is recommended that all additional aspects of signage, location, materials, colors, lettering, size, etc., be included as part of the additional Detailed Site Plan as recommended in Finding 4.1.a. above.

Although the proposed location of the signage for the specific buildings is undetermined at this time, staff believes that individual tenant signs should be located within a designated horizontal sign band above the proposed storefront windows. The signage should be consistent in location, lettering style, type, and size throughout the retail spaces.

- i. The provision of a gasoline station use on any pad site within the development. The proposed architecture shall be of a high quality and shall be compatible with the surrounding commercial/retail components with respect to materials and articulation.**

Comment: A gasoline station use is proposed at the pad site on Lot 7 as part of the subject

application. Specific details and architecture have not been finalized at this time. See Finding 2 and recommended Condition 2.

1. Prior to Detailed Site Plan approval, a Preliminary Plat of Subdivision for the subject property shall be approved by the Planning Board.

Comment: See Finding 5 below.

6. **Prior to the approval of the Detailed Site Plan the applicant shall clearly reflect on all appropriate plans the noise attenuation measures which will be utilized to address the adverse noise impacts on this site. If attenuation measures are to include structural components the applicant will be required to submit architectural plans to the Environmental Planning Section which reflect those components.**

Comment: In a memorandum from the Environmental Planning Section (Markovich to Jordan) dated September 4, 2001, the following comments were provided:

AAAlthough MD 228 has been identified as a noise generator, this Detailed Site Plan does not propose residential development and the projected noise level does not exceed 70 dBA, which is the standard for commercial development.

ADiscussion: No further information is required.@

1. At the time of Detailed Site Plan, the transportation staff will ensure that each exit from Pod 1 onto Manning Road allows for at least a two-lane exit. The transportation staff will also ensure that appropriate acceleration and deceleration lanes are provided to serve Pod 1 as a part of frontage improvements along Manning Road.

Comment: In a memorandum from the Transportation Planning Section (Masog to Jordan) dated October 15, 2001, the following comments were provided:

ACondition 9 is met; all exits onto Manning Road from the site provide for a two-lane exit.@

1. The Approved Preliminary Plan: Preliminary Plan 4-01012 for the subject property was approved by the Planning Board on May 10, 2001 (PGCPB No. 01-67). The overall lotting pattern, circulation pattern and access points shown on the site plan are in general conformance with the approved Preliminary Plan, 4-01012. Below are the specific conditions warranting discussion pertaining to conformance to Detailed Site Plan review and the approved Preliminary Plan:

1. **During the review of each Detailed Site Plan the applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assigns shall provide the Environmental Planning Section with the proposed uses for the lot, identify the location of all noise generators on the lot, and show the location of all existing dwellings and dwellings under construction within 500 feet of the proposed noise generator. If dwellings are located within 500 feet of the proposed noise generator, a noise study shall be prepared and submitted for review. The noise study shall reflect the location on the 65 dBA noise contour generated from the proposed development, with respect to all dwellings in the study area and proposed noise attenuation measures that will be provided if needed.**

Comment: See Finding No. 4. 6. above.

3. **A Type II Tree Conservation Plan shall be approved at the time of Detailed Site Plan.**

Comment: In a memorandum from the Environmental

Planning Section (Markovich to Jordan) dated September 4, 2001, the following comments were provided:

ABackground

A Proposed Lots 1-10 and Parcel >A= (Formerly Outlot 1) were previously evaluated by the Environmental Planning Section in conjunction with the review and approval of a Conceptual Site Plan (CSP-99050), a Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (4-97091), TCPI/52/97, and TCPII/112/01. Outlot 2 was previously reviewed with Conceptual Site Plan (CSP-99050), Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (4-97091), TCPI/52/97, and TCPII/39/01.

ASite Description

AThis 26.04-acre property in the M-X-T Zone is located at the southwest corner of MD 228 and existing Manning Road. A review of the available information indicates that no streams, wetlands, or 100-year floodplains are found to occur on the property. No areas of steep slopes with highly erodible soils or areas of severe slopes have been found to occur on the property. MD 228, which is located along the northern property line, has been identified as a noise generator which would have adverse noise impacts on any residential development. The soil found to occur according to the Prince George=s County Soil Survey is Beltsville silt loam which has limitations with respect to perched water tables and impeded drainage. Marlboro clay is not found to occur in the vicinity of this property. The sewer and water service categories are S-4 and W-4. According to information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Program publication titled AEcologically Significant Areas in Anne Arundel and Prince George=s Counties,@ December 1997, there are no rare, threatened, or endangered species found to occur

in the vicinity of this property. There are no designated scenic or historic roads in the vicinity of the property. This property is located in the Mattawoman Creek watershed, which is a sub-watershed of the Potomac River watershed.

AEnvironmental Review

AA Forest Stand Delineation (FSD) for proposed Lots 1-10 and Parcel >A= was submitted and reviewed in conjunction with the review of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-97091 and Conceptual Site Plan CSP-99050. The FSD was found to satisfy the requirements for a Detailed Forest Stand Delineation in accordance with the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Technical Manual. Conditions at the site have not changed sufficiently to necessitate revisions to the previously submitted FSD.

ADiscussion: No additional information is required.

AThis property (former Outlot 1) is subject to the provisions of the Prince George=s County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because the gross tract area is in excess of 40,000 square feet; there are more than 10,000 square feet of existing woodland; and there is a previously approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/52/97). A Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII/112/01) was previously approved in conjunction with a grading application for the stormwater management pond which extends onto the adjacent property. TCPII/112/01 has been reviewed and requires revisions.

AThis application also includes Outlot 2 for use as a stockpile area. During the review and approval of TCPII/39/01 for the stockpile, there was no indication that the SMECO power line would

be relocated, thus clearing Woodland Conservation Areas along the southern boundary of Outlot 2.@

The Environmental Planning section recommends approval of TCPII/121/01 and TCPII/39/01 when revised per the conditions of approval found in the Recommendation section of this staff report.

8. **At the time of Detailed Site Plan, the transportation staff will ensure that each exit from Pod 1 onto Manning Road allows for a two-lane exit. The transportation staff will also ensure that appropriate acceleration and deceleration lanes are provided to serve Pod 1 as a part of frontage improvements along Manning Road.**

Comment : See Finding No. 4. 9. above.

6. The proposed site development data for the subject application is as follows:

Zone	M-X-T
Gross/Net Tract Area (Pod 1)	
26.04 acres	
Proposed Uses (Commercial/Retail)	
Retail	87,280 square feet
Grocery Store	60,055 square feet
Fast Food	2,800 square feet
Gas Station	4,000 square feet
Bank	2,400 square feet
Day Care	6,450 square feet
Total Parking Spaces Required	
Retail & Grocery Store	
1 spc./150 sq. ft. of 1st 3,000 sq. ft. of building	20
spaces	
1 spc./200 sq. ft. above 1st 3,000 sq. ft.	722 spaces
Total	742 spaces

Fast Food

1 spc./3 seats (99 seats)	33 spaces
1 spc./50 feet of Gross Floor Area (800 sf G.F.A.)	16 spaces
Total	49 spaces

Gas Station

1 spc./employee	2 spaces
Total	2 spaces

Bank

1 spc./250 sq. ft. of 1 st 2,000 sq. ft. of Gross Floor Area	8 spaces
1 spc./400 sq. ft. of above 1 st 2,000 sq. ft.	1 space
Total	9 spaces

Day Care

1 spc./8 children (maximum enrollment 50 children)	7 spaces
Total	7 spaces

Total Parking Spaces Required	809 spaces
-------------------------------	------------

Total Parking Spaces Provided	988 spaces
-------------------------------	------------

Loading Spaces Required	5 spaces
-------------------------	----------

Loading Spaces Provided	6 spaces
-------------------------	----------

Interior Green Required	
10 percent of parking lot area	37,021 sq. ft.

Interior Green Provided	37,136 sq. ft.
-------------------------	----------------

7. Conformance with the Requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance: The subject application was referred to the Environmental Planning Section, and the development proposal was found to be in conformance with the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance when revised per the recommended conditions.

Said conditions can be found in the Recommendation section of this staff report.

8. Transportation: The subject application was referred to the Transportation Planning Section and in a memorandum (Masog to Jordan) dated October 15, 2001, the following comments were provided:

AThe site plan is acceptable from the standpoint of access and circulation. Appropriate dedication along MD 228 and Manning Road, as determined under preliminary plan 4-01012, is reflected on the plan.

AAAt the time of preliminary plan 4-01012 and conceptual plan SP-99050, a number of transportation-related conditions were placed on the property pursuant to a finding of adequate transportation facilities. The status of these conditions is as follows:

ASP-99050

A- Condition 7 indicates a trip cap for the subject site plus three areas on the north side of MD 228 (which are currently the subjects of pending preliminary plans 4-01063, 4-01064, and 4-01065). The preliminary plan trip cap was determined to conform to this cap and supercedes it.

A- Condition 8 provides a list of off-site transportation improvements. Condition 8A(1) has been met; the required traffic signal warrant study has been submitted, and SHA will determine the need for bonding prior to building permit. All other parts of this condition are enforceable at the time of building permit or are associated with another phase of the project.

A- Condition 10 was enforced at the time of preliminary plan.

A4-01012

A- Condition 6 indicates a trip cap for the subject site. A trip comparison is provided below.

A- Condition 7 provides a list of off-site transportation improvements. Condition 7A(1) has been met; the required traffic signal warrant study has been submitted, and SHA will determine the need for bonding prior to building permit. All other parts of this condition are enforceable at the time of building permit or are associated with another phase of the project.

A- Condition 9 will be enforced upon recordation.

AA number of specific uses are proposed by this plan. The following table shows the trip generation of the proposed uses and compares it with the subdivision trip cap.

Trip Generation of Subject Plan				
Use	Quantity	AM Trips	PM Trips	
Retail (assuming 50 percent pass-by)	142,390 square feet	99	456	
Fast Food (assuming 50 percent pass-by)	2,800 square feet	70	47	
Gas Station (assuming 12 fueling positions/car wash and 60 percent pass-by)	4,000 square feet	51	63	
Bank (assuming 50 percent pass-by)	2,400 square feet	15	66	
Day Care (assuming 65 percent pass-by)	8,852 square feet	14	15	
Total - As proposed on SP-01036		249	647	
Total - Trip Cap for 4-01012		185	760	

AAs noted above, the subject plan may not conform to the trip cap imposed at the time of preliminary plan. The problem occurs in the AM peak hour, and it is not the square footage that is a concern but rather the types of uses being proposed. This plan includes a large quantity of conventional retail space along with specific uses which generate a high amount of AM peak hour travel. In particular, the fast food restaurant and the gas station

are very large trip generators for their size. In order to meet the requirements, there are likely three options:

- A1. Remove or downsize either the fast food or the gas station use on the site plan. By some means, uses generating 66 AM peak hour trips would need to be removed.
- A2. Consider providing a more detailed trip generation study. However, the rates used in to create the above table are published trip rates, and the pass-by rates are fairly generous. Any different assumptions must be well-documented.
- A3. Consider obtaining a reconsideration of the trip cap under preliminary plan 4-01012. All critical intersections were shown to operate acceptably with site-generated traffic and with improvements being implemented by the applicant, and in no case was the AM peak hour critical. Under this strategy, however, the applicant will need to determine any impact on the trip cap for the conceptual plan, and resolve that issue accordingly.

Aln conclusion, the transportation planning staff has no objection to circulation elements of the plan, and it appears that most conditions are well on their way to being met. However, the AM trip cap imposed at the time of subdivision approval must be better addressed before the subject plan can be approved.@

Recommended Transportation Planning conditions can be found in the Recommendation section of this staff report.

1. Conformance with the Requirements of the Zoning Ordinance in the M-X-T Zone, including the Requirements of the Prince George=s County Landscape Manual: The required findings of Section 27-546(d) for development in the M-X-T Zone are as follows:

1. The proposed development is in conformance with the purposes and other provisions of this division;

Comment: The proposed development is in conformance with the purposes and other provisions of this division. The site is located within close proximity to a major interchange, MD 210 and MD 228. The overall development provides for all three of the required uses in the M-X-T Zone, Residential, Retail and Office. The overall

development has the potential to encourage a 24-hour environment with the inclusion of a retail and office component. In general, the proposed development creates a dynamic, functional relationship among individual uses with the potential for a distinctive visual character and identity.

2. The proposed development has an outward orientation which either is physically and visually integrated with existing adjacent development or catalyzes adjacent community improvement and rejuvenation;

Comment: Adjacent development relevant to the subject property is sparse. The only development adjacent to the subject property is a few single-family detached residential lots on the north side of proposed development Pod 1. A subdivision of existing single-family detached homes is west of and in proximity to proposed development Pods 2 and 3. The proposed development provides for a mix of uses that should be a stimulus for economic revitalization for this area of the county. Staff believes that the infusion of a quality commercial/retail component in this area will ultimately improve the quality of life and present a positive image for the community as a whole.

3. The proposed development is compatible with existing and proposed development in the vicinity;

Comment: Given that the surrounding community is comprised of residential, parkland, and small-scale commercial development, staff believes that the proposed development is compatible with, and complementary to, existing and proposed development in the vicinity.

4. The mix of uses, and the arrangement and design of

buildings and other improvements, reflect a cohesive development capable of sustaining an independent environment of continuing quality and stability;

Comment: The mix of proposed uses, and the arrangement and design of buildings and other improvements, which will include an area specifically designated for use by the general public as a gathering place, will reflect a cohesive development capable of sustaining an independent environment of continuing quality and stability.

5. If the development is staged, each building phase is designed as a self-sufficient entity, while allowing for effective integration of subsequent phases;

Comment: In general, each building phase is designed as a self-sufficient entity, while allowing for effective integration of subsequent phases. Staged development, or phases, has not been proposed by the applicant. In order to ensure that the retail and office component are constructed in a timely fashion, the preceding Conceptual Site Plan, CSP-99050, required the following:

ACertificates of occupancy shall be issued for 75,000 square feet of commercial/retail and office components in development Pod 1 by the issuance of 50 percent, or 400 units, of the residential permits in development Pod 2. Furthermore, certificates of occupancy shall be issued for 125,000 square feet of commercial/retail and office components in the entire development by the issuance of 75 percent, or 600 units, of the residential permits in development Pod 2.@

6. The pedestrian system is convenient and

comprehensively designed to encourage pedestrian activity within the development;

Comment: In general, the pedestrian system is convenient and is comprehensively designed to encourage pedestrian activity within the development. Proposed pedestrian circulation within and at the perimeter of the individual pods does promote and encourage pedestrian activity.

7. On the Detailed Site Plan, in areas of the development which are to be used for pedestrian activities or as gathering places for people, adequate attention has been paid to human scale, high quality urban design, and other amenities, such as types and textures of materials, landscaping and screening, street furniture, and lighting; and

Comment: The subject application is limited in its review, in that venues in which pedestrian and/or public gathering activities will take place have not been specifically determined and detailed at this time. The applicant has stated their interest in, and commitment to, providing at least one of said types of public gathering places within this development pod prior to its 100 percent completion. See Finding 4.1.b. for the recommended condition.

8. On a Conceptual Site Plan for a property placed in the M-X-T Zone by a Sectional Map Amendment, transportation facilities that are existing; that are under construction; or for which one hundred percent (100%) of construction funds are allocated within the adopted County Capital Improvement Program, or the current State Consolidation Transportation Program, or will be provided by the applicant, will be adequate to carry anticipated traffic for the proposed development. The finding by the Council of adequate transportation

facilities at the time of Conceptual Site Plan approval shall not prevent the Planning Board from later amending this finding during its review of subdivision plats.

Comment: Said finding is not applicable to the subject development proposal.

The Detailed Site Plan is in general conformance with the regulations governing development in the M-X-T Zone.

Sections 4.2, Commercial and Industrial Landscape Strip Requirements, 4.3(b)(c), Parking Lot Requirements, Perimeter Landscape Strip Requirements, Interior Planting, and 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, apply to the subject site. The proposed plans are in full conformance with the requirements of the *Landscape Manual*.

1. Trails: The subject plan was referred to the Transportation Planning Section for review and in a memorandum (Shaffer to Jordan) dated October 30, 2001, it was found that the plan was acceptable when revised pursuant to conditions of approval reflected in the Recommendation section of this staff report.

1. Urban Design: The Urban Design staff has reviewed the subject application and provides the following comments:

a. The following finding was approved by the Planning Board as part of CSP-99050 for the subject property:

A development Pods 1 and 2 are bisected by an existing Southern Maryland Electric Company public utilities easement. Although burying the electrical line would provide for a more aesthetically pleasing development, the development review process does not afford the Planning Board the authority to mandate any

activity within a public utilities easement controlled by another agency. Neither the applicant nor the respective public utility can be forced to remove the existing utility line through this process. It is recommended that the applicant investigate burying the line.@

The proposed development provides for relocation of the noted power line within Pod 1 instead of burying it. As opposed to bisecting the development pod, the line will be relocated to run along the southwest and northeast perimeters of the site, adjacent to the Manning Road East and Berry Road right-of-way. Staff believes that the proposed relocation will provide for a more aesthetically pleasing commercial area, and will alleviate the necessity of Southern Maryland Electric Company (SMECO) servicing the power line in the middle of the shopping center. Notwithstanding the positive aspects of the relocation, staff has the following concerns:

All power lines lie within a public utility easement, which allows for access to, and maintenance of the easement and power line by the utility company. Maintenance of the easement generally entails clear-cutting all vegetation within the easement so as to provide a clear path to the power line and to prevent any vertical obstruction from compromising the power line and its operation. The relocated power line will run parallel to the rear of the property, along Manning Road East, within a required landscape yard per Section 4.3.a. of the *Landscape Manual*. The rear facade of the proposed Giant Food store and several retail establishments within the shopping center will face Manning Road East and the approved, yet-to-be-constructed, residential subdivision of Manokeek. Staff believes that the visual screening of the noted rear facades from the approved subdivision and the adjacent

right-of-way is a critical element in the aesthetic quality and success of both the proposed shopping center and residential subdivision. The proposed plan provides for a combination of low-growing plantings on a berm in the required landscape yard within the SMECO easement, and a continuous row of columnar evergreen trees directly adjacent to 12-foot-high masonry screening walls at the Giant Food store rear facade next to the loading area. Although a responsive approach by the applicant appears to address the necessity of buffering/screening the rear of the shopping center from the adjacent right-of-way and the approved subdivision, while acknowledging the overall context of the location within the public utility easement, staff is concerned about the treatment of the proposed plantings within the SMECO right-of-way. A letter from SMECO to the applicant's consultant, included as part of the Planning Board back-up (Gerred to Dunn) dated November 6, 2001, provides the following:

ASouthern Maryland Electric Cooperative, Inc. has reviewed the >Detailed Site Plan Landscape and Lighting Plan= dated 10/05/01 for the above-referenced project.

AWe generally concur in the proposed line route and with the proposed plant selection and placement. The taller species are slow growing and tend not to be a problem in a transmission right-of-way; however, SMECO still reserves the right to trim these trees as required by Maryland law and prudent utility practice.@

Staff had requested a minimum of a letter from SMECO which defines the utility's position with regard to the proposed planting plan and a copy of the proposed landscape plan signed by a SMECO representative to indicate the utility's approval of the proposed plantings within the power line

easement. The letter quoted above does not specifically reference the subject site plan by name or number, and the requested signed plans have not been forwarded to staff as of the writing of this staff report. Therefore, it is recommended that prior to signature approval that the applicant provide a letter specifically referencing the subject Detailed Site Plan by name and number which defines the utility company's position with regard to the proposed landscape/planting plans. Furthermore, the applicant should provide a current copy of the proposed landscape plan signed by a SMECO representative to indicate the utility's approval of the proposed plantings within the power line easement.

- b. Two retail pad sites, Lots 1 and 2, are located at the north edge of the subject property adjacent to the proposed stormwater management pond. Service access to the future structures will be via a single service drive at the rear of Lot 1 which will terminate on Lot 2 and provide two loading spaces between the two buildings. Open green space will exist between the two buildings, and the loading spaces will be visible from the shopping center's main parking lot since no landscaping or screening has been proposed in this area as part of the subject plan. All loading spaces must be concealed from public view. Therefore, it is recommended that prior to signature approval the landscape plans be revised to provide a combination of shade trees, evergreen trees, and shrubbery to screen the loading spaces between Lots 1 and 2 from view.

Upon further review at the time of Detailed Site Plan submission for Lots 1 and 2, a masonry screen wall may also be required between the loading spaces and the recommended plantings.

12. The subject application was referred to the Accokeek Development Review District Commission (ADRC), and in a letter (Thompson to Jordan) dated November 19, 2001, the ADRC expressed full approval of and support for the development proposal as submitted.
13. The subject application was referred to all applicable agencies and divisions; no significant issues were identified. The Department of Public Works & Transportation provided comments for designated roadway improvements within the right-of-way. The plans should address these comments at the time of the review of permits.
14. The Detailed Site Plan represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the Site Design Guidelines of Subtitle 27, Part 3, Division 9, of the Prince George's County Code without requiring unreasonable cost and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

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 Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII/112/01) and further APPROVED the Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCP/II/39/01) and further APPROVED the Detailed Site Plan DSP-01036, Manokeek, Lots 1-10 and Parcel A for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certificate approval, the Detailed Site Plan shall be revised as follows:
 - a. Provide the height and dimensions of all buildings.
 - b. Provide all building regulation requirements, height, setbacks, etc., in the site data.
 - c. Provide specific details of the streetscape treatment, special/decorative pavers, planters, furnishings, lighting, etc., for Lot 4. Furthermore, prior to final approval said streetscape treatment details shall be referred to the Accokeek Development Review Commission (ADRC) for review and comments.
 - d. Provide specific design details for the designated focal point area to include but not be limited to materials, landscaping/screening, furnishings, and lighting. Furthermore, prior to final approval said focal point area design, layout, details,

etc., shall be referred to the ADRC for review and comments.

- e. Provide plant quantities, or a combination of plantings, berms/walls, that exceed the requirements of Sections 4.3a and 4.2a of the *Landscape Manual* by no less than 100 percent.
 - f. Provide plant quantities that exceed the requirements of Section 4.3c of the *Landscape Manual* by no less than 25 percent.
 - g. Provide a letter from Southern Maryland Electric Company (SMECO) specifically referencing the subject Detailed Site Plan by name and number, which defines the utility company's position/support with regard to the proposed landscape/planting plans. Furthermore, the applicant shall provide a current copy of the proposed landscape plan signed by a SMECO representative to indicate the utility's approval of the proposed plantings within the power line easement.
 - h. Provide a combination of shade trees, evergreen trees, and shrubs between the proposed buildings at Lots 1 and 2 to screen the loading spaces from view. Quantities, species, and location of plantings shall be determined by the staff of the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.
2. Prior to approval of the next Detailed Site Plan, the applicant shall demonstrate conformance to the approved trip cap maximum of 185 trips in the AM peak hour as required by Preliminary Plan 4-01012.
- Fulfillment of this condition shall be determined by the Transportation Planning Section.
3. Prior to release of any building permits for Lots 1, 2, 3 (designated for day care use), 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, approval of Detailed Site Plans with architecture by the Prince George's County Planning Board shall be required. Furthermore, Lot 3, designated for day care use, must provide an outdoor play area as required by the Zoning Ordinance.
4. Prior to the approval of a Detailed Site Plans for pad sites on Lots 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, a Detailed Site Plan which addresses the following shall be submitted and approved:
- a. The streetscape treatment of the subject property to include sidewalks, special pavers, interior landscaping at building frontages, lighting, furnishings, and sitting areas.
 - b. The proposed signage for the commercial/retail components with special attention given, but not limited, to location, materials, colors, lettering, size, etc.
5. Prior to certificate approval, TCPII/112/01 shall be revised as follows:
- a. Revise the Landscape Plan and the TCPII to more effectively use the perimeter berms for reforestation and landscaping and avoid conflicts with the proposed

SMECO alignment.

- b. Revise the TCPII to include the Clagett property on which a large portion of the stormwater management pond is being constructed.
 - c. Revise the reforestation planting schedule to include at least 65 percent of the plant materials as larger caliper trees, one inch or larger.
 - d. Show the location of the reforestation signs on the plans and revise the edge management notes per the previously approved plan.
6. Prior to certificate approval, TCPII/39/01 shall be revised as follows:
 - a. Show the relocated SMECO power line and the clearing associated with that relocation and the revised location of the proposed Woodland Conservation Areas.
 - b. Revise the worksheet to include the additional clearing and remove all Woodland Conservation Areas from the proposed power line alignment.
7. The pedestrian connection from relocated Manning Road East to the southern portion of the parking lot (behind the grocery store) shall be ten feet wide and asphalt (as shown on the submitted site plan) and shall be handicapped accessible.
8. All other internal paths shall be a minimum of six feet wide and handicapped accessible.
9. All sidewalk curb cuts shall be handicapped accessible.
10. Appropriate signage and pavement markings shall be provided in order to ensure safe pedestrian crossings at the Berry Road and relocated Manning Road East intersection.
11. Appropriate signage and pavement markings shall also be provided in order to ensure safe pedestrian crossings on relocated Manning Road East at the proposed pedestrian connection (shown on the site plan along the sewer right-of-way). This crossing shall connect to the planned sidewalk and curb cut on the south side of relocated Manning Road East along Parcel J at the road intersection.

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.

* * * * *

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 Eley, seconded by Commissioner Lowe, with Commissioners Eley, Lowe, Scott and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioner Brown absent at its regular meeting held on Thursday, December 6, 2001, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 6th day of December 2001.

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:JJ:rmk