

C O R R E C T E D 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 March 6, 2003, regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-02059 for Alban Forestville, Parcel Q – Consolidated Storage Mini U-Store, the Planning Board finds:

1. The site consists of 4.52 acres in the I-1 Zone and is located at the northeast quadrant of the intersection of the Capital Beltway (I-495) and Pennsylvania Avenue (MD 4). Detailed site plan approval is required in accordance with Section 27-475.04 for a consolidated storage facility in the I-1 Zone and by Condition #1 of Preliminary Plan 4-02012, which states the following:

Prior to the approval of grading permits for each parcel, a limited detailed site plan addressing screening, buffering and views from the Capital Beltway, access location and design onto Westphalia Road, and noise mitigation shall be approved by the Planning Board.

Parcel Q is located approximately 200 feet east of the Capital Beltway. The site fronts on Westphalia Road and is approximately 1,000 feet north of the intersection with Pennsylvania Avenue (MD 4). Between the site and the Capital Beltway is an existing, landscaped stormwater management pond. The applicant has provided additional landscaping along the property line. The combined landscape materials will adequately address screening, buffering and views from the Capital Beltway. The end walls of the storage buildings have been treated with brick to further ensure an attractive view from the Beltway. A storage building with an office and a residential caretaker's apartment runs parallel to Westphalia Road. The building is entirely faced with brick with a red, standing-seam metal roof. The building screens from view the storage buildings on the balance of the site. Fencing with brick columns and plant materials have been provided on the ends of the building and along the side yards for approximately 200 feet to further conceal the other storage buildings from Westphalia Road.

With regard to access location and design onto Westphalia Road, the Transportation Planning Section, in a memorandum dated February 25, 2003 (Masog to Wagner), indicates that the site plan is acceptable from the standpoint of access and circulation.

With regard to noise mitigation, the Urban Design Section received two memorandums; one dated January 15, 2003 from Wendy Irminger, Community Planning Division, and one dated January 15, 2003, from Larry Carson, Deputy Base Civil Engineer, Andrews Air Force Base.

The Community Planning Division offered the following comments:

“The key planning issues at this location, just north of Andrews Air Force Base, involve aircraft noise and safety hazards. Land use compatibility with airport operations are assessed in the 1998 Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) study based on combinations of exposure to noise and accident potential. The location of the proposed development is within the 75-80 DNL noise contours and Accident Potential Zone (APZ) I. Accordingly, the master plan recommends the following actions at pages 106-7:

- “Require the use of sound attenuating construction materials or techniques to maintain the interior office noise levels consistent with state noise regulations.
- “Preclude any commercial land use that might impair a pilot’s vision or navigational precision.
- “Establish a floor-to-area ratio of 0.3 and require that building orientation and design provide sufficient open areas for emergency landings.

“The AICUZ study states (page 4-7) that ‘about 16 percent of accidents occurred in the region covering APZ I and APZ II.’ For this reason, the study strongly encourages land use planning and controls for the protection of the public. Warehousing, as a low-density, low-intensity industrial land use, is a compatible land use in APZ I. Aircraft noise at this location will be significant. Noise level reduction (NLR) techniques should be incorporated into the design and construction of portions of buildings where the public is received and office areas.”

Andrews Air Force Base offered the following comments:

“Commercial land uses are not compatible with APZ 1; however, limited low-density, low-intensity commercial land use is permitted at the discretion of local planners. The sponsor should be aware that 10 percent of all aircraft accidents occur within this zone. Part of this facility is also located within the 75-80 dB noise contour; sound attenuation materials need to be incorporated into the design and construction in any commercial facility within a noise level zone above 70 dB.

“With an elevation of 288 feet, no objects on this property (including the building, equipment to erect the building, and trees) should exceed 97 feet. The proposed building is only <30 feet high, construction equipment height is not specified. Landscape plan should only include trees with a maximum mature height of less than 97 feet.

“Any object (whether temporary or permanent) that exceeds 42 feet high requires the sponsor to file FAA form 7460-1. Equipment used to erect the building most likely will require the sponsor to file FAA form 7460-1.”

Based on the above information, a condition should be incorporated into the recommendation section requiring that the architectural plans be certified by a professional engineer with competency in acoustical analysis that building shells will attenuate ultimate exterior noise levels

to an interior level not to exceed 45 dBA (Ldn) in all residential areas. The storage units do not have to comply with this condition.

2. The site development data is as follows:

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone(s)	I-1	I-1
Use(s)	Vacant	Consolidated Storage
Acreage	4.52	4.52
Lots	0	0
Parcels	1	1
Square Footage/GFA	0	68,441
Dwelling Units:	N/A	N/A

OTHER DEVELOPMENT DATA

Parking spaces required	8 spaces
Parking spaces provided	8 spaces
Loading spaces required	4 spaces
Loading spaces provided	4 spaces

3. The detailed site plan is in compliance with all applicable requirements of the *Landscape Manual*.
4. The detailed site plan is in general compliance with all Zoning Ordinance requirements for a consolidated storage facility in the I-1 Zone in that no entrance to individual storage units will be visible from a street or from adjoining land in a residential zone. The entrances to the storage units have been screened by a solid wall with landscaping along the wall. No building exceeds the height limitations of 36 feet.

The detailed site plan is not in conformance with the signage requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. The applicant has proposed two building-mounted signs. Section 27-613(b)(1), height of building-mounted signage, requires that no sign extend more than 12 feet above the roofline of that part of the building to which it is attached. Section 27-613 (c)(3)(B)(ii) requires that the area of all signs on a building shall not be more than two square feet for each one lineal foot of width along the front of the building (measured along the wall facing the front of the lot or the wall containing the principal entrance to the building, whichever is greater), to a maximum of four hundred square feet.

The applicant has proposed a sign that extends approximately 20 feet above the roofline of the building facing Westphalia Road. The area of the sign is not clear on the signage detail. Based on a building length of 174.7 feet, the area of the sign should not exceed 350 square feet.

A sign has also been provided on the western end of one of the storage buildings. That sign meets the height requirement, but exceeds the maximum 400-square-foot size limitation by 50 feet.

Both signs should be revised to be in conformance with the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance or the applicant should file for a Departure from Sign Design Standards prior to the issuance of a sign permit.

5. In a memorandum dated January 29, 2003 (Markovich to Wagner), the Environmental Planning Section offered the following comments:

The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed the above referenced detailed site plan and the recently approved Type II tree conservation plan, TCPII/126/95-01. The Detailed Site Plan (DSP-02059) as submitted is consistent with the approved Type II tree conservation plan and is recommended for approval.

Background

This site was previously evaluated by the Environmental Planning Section in conjunction with approvals of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (4-02012), Detailed Site Plan SP-97022, Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/58/93), and Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII/126/95).

Site Description

This application for a portion of the Alban-Forestville site includes Parcel "Q," which was entirely forested at the time of the approval of the first tree conservation plan, but was later cleared in its entirety in accordance with the approved TCPII. Streams, wetlands, wetland buffers, 100-year floodplain, severe slopes, and steep slopes with highly erodible soils have not been found to occur within the limits of this application. According to the Prince George's County Soil Survey, the soils found on this site include Sassafras fine sandy loam, Beltsville silt loam, and Sassafras gravelly loam, which has no significant limitation with respect to the development of the property as proposed by this application. According to information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Program publication entitled *Ecologically 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 this application. The sewer and water service categories for this property are S-3 and W-3. The property included in this application is located in the Southwest Branch watershed of the Patuxent River basin and in the Developing Tier as designated by the adopted General Plan..

Environmental Review

As revisions are made to the plans, the revision boxes on each plan sheet shall be used to describe the changes, the date made, and by whom.

- a. A forest stand delineation (FSD) was submitted and approved during the review of the Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/58/93, and again with Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-02012 and the revision to TCPI/58/93.

Discussion: No additional information is required with respect to the forest stand delineation.

b. This property is subject to the requirements of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because the gross tract area is over 40,000 square feet, there is more than 10,000 square feet of existing woodland, and there are previously approved tree conservation plans, TCPI/58/93 and TCPII/126/95-01. The recent TCPII approval, associated with the approval of DSP-02026 for Parcel "P" of Alban-Forestville, addressed the entire property, as did the original TCPII approval. DSP-02059 has been found to conform to the approved Tree Conservation Plans TCPII/126/95-01 and TCPI/58/93.

Discussion: No additional information is required with respect to the tree conservation plans.

c. Streams, wetlands, 100-year floodplains, severe slopes, or steep slopes with highly erodible soils are found to occur on the overall property but not within the limits of this application for Parcel "Q." Those features compose the Patuxent River Primary Management Area or PMA.

Discussion: No additional information is required with respect to the PMA.

No other significant environmental constraints have been identified for this property.

6. In a memorandum dated February 24, 2003 (Masog to Wagner), the Transportation Planning Section offered the following comments:

The Transportation Planning Section has reviewed the detailed site plans referenced above. The subject property consists of two subdivided parcels in the I-1 zone. The property is located north of MD 4 between Westphalia Road and the Capital Beltway. This property was subdivided as Alban-Forestville, Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-02012. On Parcel Q, which is 4.52 acres, the applicant proposes to develop a consolidated storage facility

with 68,441 square feet in 575 units. On Parcel R, the applicant proposes to construct an access roadway. No other development is proposed by this plan on Parcel R.

Review Comments–Parcel Q

The site plan is acceptable from the standpoint of access and circulation.

The subdivision resolution contains a trip cap condition. This condition restricts development on the entire 43.55-acre site to uses generating no more than 974 AM and 974 PM peak-hour vehicle trips. Based on the submitted plans for Parcel Q and the

approved plans for Parcel Q (about 37 percent of the overall site), staff has determined the following trip generation for the site:

- a. Under the detailed site plan for Parcel P, the site trip generation was computed at 120 AM and 114 PM peak-hour trips. That plan proposed a vehicle repair/office building and indoor/outdoor display and storage areas. That plan was approved as Detailed Site Plan DSP-02026 and is under development at this time.
- b. The subject plan proposes consolidated storage mini-warehouse buildings totaling 68,441 square feet with 575 units. Using rates in the Institute of Transportation Engineers' *Trip Generation Manual* for mini-warehouse, the use would generate 12 AM and 18 PM peak-hour trips.
- c. The total trip generation resulting from the approved plus the pending plans is 132 AM and 132 PM peak-hour trips. Parcels P and Q together are well below the trip cap for the entire site and also well under the portion of the trip cap that would have been assumed to be generated by the two parcels.

*7[8] The detailed site plan is in general conformance to the requirements of Preliminary Plan 4-02012, PGCPB Resolution 02-72 C. In a memorandum dated January 10, 2003, the Subdivision Office (Chellis to Wagner), offered the following comments:

Condition 4 requires that development be in accordance with the approved stormwater management plan #8003950-1994-00. Staff received a memorandum from the DER Watershed Protection Branch dated January 14, 2003 (DeGuzman to Wagner), stating that the site plan is not consistent with the approved concept plan. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, the plans should be revised to the satisfaction of DER to be in conformance with the stormwater concept plan.

Condition 5.f. relates to the denied access of Parcel Q onto Westphalia Road and requires the creation of an access easement pursuant to Section 24-128(b)(9) of the Subdivision Regulations. The access easement should be recorded in the County Land Records prior to certification of the detailed site plan.

*8. The detailed site plan represent a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines without requiring unreasonable costs and without detracting substantially from the proposed development for its intended use.

*Denotes Correction

Underlining indicates new language
[Brackets } indicate deleted language

*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-02059, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to the approval of building permits, the architectural plans shall be certified by a professional engineer with competency in acoustical analysis that building shells will attenuate ultimate exterior noise levels to an interior level not to exceed 45 dBA (Ldn) in all buildings containing residential uses.
2. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan:
 - a. The plans shall be revised to the satisfaction of The Department of Environmental Resources Watershed Protection Branch to be in conformance with the stormwater concept plan.
 - b. An access easement for vehicular access from Parcel R to Parcel Q shall be recorded in the County Land Records prior to certification of the detailed site plan.
 - c. All signs shall be revised to be in conformance with the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, or the applicant shall file for a Departure from Sign Design Standards prior to the issuance of a sign permit.
 - d. Additional landscaping consisting of evergreen trees shall be provided along the property line between Parcel Q and Parcel R.

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.

*Denotes Correction

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets} indicate deleted language

* * * * *

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 Lowe, seconded by Commissioner Scott, with Commissioners Lowe, Scott,

PGCPB No. 03-41(C)
File No. DSP-02059
Page 8

Eley and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, March 6, 2003, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 27th day of March 2003.

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:GW:rmk