

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 April 10, 2003 regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-02057 for Greater Mt. Nebo AME Church/Day Care Center, the Planning Board finds:

1. Detailed Site Plan DSP-02057 proposes a church for 600 members and a day care center with an enrollment of 60 children. The site is located northeast of the intersection of US 301 north and MD 214 (Central Avenue). The site consists of 80.60 acres in the R-A Zone. Detailed Site Plan review for a church on a property of this size is not normally required. Detailed Site Plan review is required by Section 27-445.03 for approval of the proposed day care center.

2. Development Data Summary

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone(s)	R-A	R-A
Use(s)	Vacant	Church/Day Care
Acreage	80.60 acres	80.60 acres
Lots	1	1
Square Footage/GFA	Vacant	22,000 sq. ft.

Other Development Data

Parking Required	
(1 space per four seats—church)	150 spaces
(1 space per eight children—day care)	8 spaces
Total Spaces	158 spaces
Parking Provided	
Handicapped Spaces	7 spaces
Standard Spaces	236 spaces
Total Spaces	243 spaces
Play area required	2,250 sq. ft
Play area provided	4,500 sq. ft.

3. The Detailed Site Plan is in general conformance to Preliminary Plan 4-01052 (PGCPB No.

01-242).

4. The subject plan is proposing the construction of a church/day care building with 22,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area (GFA) and, therefore, is subject to the requirements of the *Landscape Manual*. The subject application has been found to be in conformance with the *Landscape Manual*.

The proposed building is 120 feet by 100 feet and is 36 feet in height from grade on the north and 46 feet in height on the south side elevation. The proposed exterior of the building is split-faced block with a standing seam metal roof. To break up the mass of the building, windows have been proposed on all four elevations. The placement of these windows in conjunction with doors creates a balanced façade. The colors and size of the split-faced block and the roof-and building-mounted lighting details have not been provided. The plans should be revised to include details of the above-referenced architectural elements of the proposed church building.

The day care center will include 1,851 square feet of the proposed 22,000 square feet. Section 27-445.03(a)(1)(A)(iv) requires sufficient shade during the warmer months for the play area. The applicant is proposing four shade trees to be located to provide shade for the play area. Should the applicant install outdoor play equipment for the children to utilize while at the day care, the equipment should be installed in accordance with the Consumer Product Safety Commission's Handbook for Public Playground Safety (pub. #325). Special attention should be given to the required fall zones, which vary depending on the equipment, but are generally six feet wide and follow the contours of the piece of play equipment. No piece of equipment should intrude into another piece of equipment's fall zone. The applicant should provide proper fall zones and resilient surface materials for areas where play equipment is installed.

Section 27-617 of the Zoning Ordinance sets the requirements for signage. For a sign for an institutional use, the Zoning Ordinance allows a maximum area of 48 square feet with a maximum height of 8 feet; the sign may be attached to the building or be freestanding. The minimum setback requirement is 15 feet from adjoining land in any residential zone. It should be noted that the maximum number of signs allowed is one per street the property fronts on. The applicant did not submit signage for review. No pylon-mounted signage exists in the surrounding area. The viewshed of the area should be considered in regard to signage. The plans should be revised to include attractive ground-mounted signage in accordance with the height restrictions in the Zoning Ordinance. This signage detail should include, but not be limited to, colors, materials, lighting, location and a 20-scale landscape plan.

5. The Environmental Planning Section in a memorandum dated February 7, 2002 (Finch to Whitmore), offered the following comments:

“This site is subject to the provisions of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance because it is more than 40,000 square feet in size and contains more than 10,000 square feet of woodland. A Forest Stand Delineation was previously approved in conjunction with the approved TCPI. This site has an approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/25/97-01). A Type II TCP (TCPII/08/02) was previously reviewed and approved on April 15, 2002, but no copy had been supplied with the Detailed Site Plan submittal, and there was no copy in the permanent file.

“A plan titled ‘Combined Tree Conservation and Landscape Plan’ (at a scale of 1 inch = 100 feet) was submitted with the subject application, but it does not have an approval stamp. It is the policy of the Environmental Planning Section that the landscape plan and TCPII be kept separate so that if revisions to one plan are necessary it does not require a complete review and approval of the other plan.

“The Detailed Site Plan has been submitted at two scales. The composite site plan is at a scale of 1 inch = 120 feet. The site development plan is at a scale of 1 inch = 60 feet. The approved TCPII and the ‘Combined Tree Conservation and Landscape Plan’ are both at a scale of 1 inch = 100 feet. To facilitate review of the plan, the TCPII and the associated plan must be at the same scale, but no greater than 1” = 50 feet, unless individual circumstance justify an alternative scale.

“A comparison of the TCPII and the Detailed Site Plan indicates that site features have been modified and stormwater management ponds have been added which have significantly altered the limits of disturbance, and propose impacts to a woodland preservation area. The approved TCPII has not been signed by a qualified professional. Any revision to the TCPII will require the signature and dating by a qualified professional. Note #22 on the TCPII includes inaccurate information regarding the Woodland Conservation requirements for the site. This information requires correction or removal before the approval of any revision.”

**Comment:** Conditions 1.c – 1.f in the recommendation section of this report address the above concerns.

6. The Permit Review Section had numerous comments, all of which have been addressed.
7. The Department of Environmental Resources has found the plans acceptable as submitted.
8. The Subdivision Section and Transportation Planning Section have found the proposed church and day care consistent with Preliminary Plan 4-01052 and PGCPB No. 01-242.
9. The State Highway Administration in a memorandum dated January 13, 2003 (McDonald to Whitmore), offered the following comments:

“This office completed a review of the submitted plan and supplemental documentation. Based on the information provided we note that the applicant is required to comply with conditions 3 and 4 per MNCPPC Resolution PGCPB No. 01-242. Given, the fact that these conditions require a permit subject to rules and regulations of the Maryland State Highway Administration, we recommend that the above be a part of Detailed Site Plan DSP-02057 approval.”

**Comment:** The proposed application meets Conditions 3 and 4 of Preliminary Plan 4-01052 PGCPB No. 01-242.

10. The City of Bowie indicated to staff in a telephone conversation in March (Fenton to Whitmore)

that the city did not intend to comment on the subject application.

11. 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/08/02) and further APPROVED Detailed Site Plan DSP-02057 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to signature approval, the following revisions shall be made or information supplied:
  - a. A note shall be placed on the plan stating that no pylon-mounted signage shall be allowed. Any future signage for the Daycare shall be ground-mounted and shall be in accordance with Section 27-617 of the Zoning Ordinance.
  - b. Architectural elevations shall be submitted which will list the building materials used for the church structure where the daycare operation will be located and the lighting plan for same structure.
  - c. The TCPII and the Detailed Site Plan shall be revised so the scale shall be the same. Should the applicant use a scale greater than 1 inch = 60 feet, they shall provide a statement of justification explaining the necessity of this scale.
  - d. The TCPII and the Landscape Plan shall be two separate plans.
  - e. The TCPII shall be revised to show the reconfiguration of all proposed site elements, show the location of stormwater management facilities proposed on the site, and show a limit of disturbance which is in conformance with the Detailed Site Plan and the sediment and erosion control plan. Correction to the Woodland Conservation Worksheet or other notes that result from these revisions shall also be made.
  - f. All revisions to the Tree Conservation Plan shall be noted in the revision box; the plan shall be re-signed and dated by a qualified professional and submitted as a revision to the TCPII as part of the current Detailed Site Plan application.
  - g. The landscape plan shall be revised to include appropriate plant schedules and a plant list in accordance with the *Landscape Manual*.

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 Scott, seconded by Commissioner Eley, with Commissioners Scott, Eley and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioner Lowe absent at its regular meeting held on Thursday, April 10, 2003, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 8<sup>th</sup> day of May 2003.

Trudye Morgan Johnson  
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin  
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:LW:rmk