

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 30, 2006, regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-04080/01 for Ritchie Station Market, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The subject application requests approval of a Sam's Club, a retaining wall, fence and welcome center for an integrated shopping center.

2. **Development Data Summary**

	<b>EXISTING</b>	<b>PROPOSED</b>
Zone	I-3 and R-R	I-3 and R-R
Use(s)	Vacant	Integrated Shopping Center
Acreage	101.83	101.83
Parcels	10	6
Gross Floor Area	0	135,441 Sam's Club 180 Welcome Center

3. **Location:** The site is in Planning Area 75A and Council District 6. More specifically, it is located on the south side of Ritchie Marlboro Road, immediately west of the Capital Beltway (I-495/I-95).
4. **Surroundings and Use:** The subject property is bounded to the north by largely abandoned single-family detached dwellings, to the west by townhouse development, to the east by I-495, and to the south by industrial use.
5. **Previous Approvals:** The proposed site is the subject of Preliminary Plan 4-04184 and District Council Bill No. CB-65-2003. A stormwater concept approval was issued by the Department of Environmental Resources on July 22, 2004, and will be effective for three years, or until July 22, 2007. DSP-04080, a detailed site plan for infrastructure, was approved for the site on May 12, 2005. PGCPB Resolution No. 05-118 was adopted on June 2, 2006, formalizing the approval. In addition, Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/203/91-01 was approved together with the detailed site plan for infrastructure that was approved for the subject property. In 1991, TCPII/203/91 was approved for the property.
6. **Design Features:** The site would be accessed from Ritchie Marlboro Road via Ritchie Station Court. The proposed 25-foot-high, 135,441-square-foot Sam's Club is located in the southern central portion of the site, with general parking immediately to its north and parking for the tire center along its easterly side. Utilizing a brick material, known as "Quik Brik," as the primary

architectural sheathing material, the architecture of the structure presents balanced massing with some articulation and draws interest to the main entrance to the club by well-placed signage. A well-camouflaged loading area, including five 12-foot-wide by 130-foot long loading spaces, is located on the easterly side of the proposed building. A 10-foot-high screen wall, constructed of the same “Quik Brik” material as the store, largely screens the loading area from view.

A welcome center provided for the development is designed to resemble a train station. Cem-Trim, a fiber cement product, is utilized for the posts and trim in place of wood and the roofing is a combination of champagne-colored standing seam metal and light gray architectural roof shingles. Siding materials include Cemplank shingle siding, Cemplank scalloped gray siding, brick in a running bond, pre-cast concrete in a natural color and split face concrete masonry unit (CMU ) construction. The combination of massing and the use of architectural detail for the welcome center are aesthetically pleasing and complements the Sam’s Club architecture.

Also included in the subject application are several walls. The front retaining wall, that runs part way along the Beltway ramp, along Ritchie Marlboro Road and up into the site on Ritchie Station Court, would be clad at its base with split face CMU and above with brick. The brick portion of the wall is well articulated with a soldier course running near the top of the wall. The wall is punctuated with well-spaced piers of a contrasting design but using the same materials. The second wall design, located along the Beltway, known as the “garden retaining wall,” would be much like the front retaining wall, but improved in appearance by not having the split face CMU visible. The third wall is the rear retaining wall that would be visible from the adjacent townhouse development. It would be constructed of a tan keystone block, made to fit in better with its surroundings by landscaping including creeping English ivy and topped by a cedar board-on-board fence stained to match the keystone block.

## COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **Zoning Ordinance:** The subject application has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements in the I-3 and R-R Zones and the site plan design guidelines of the Zoning Ordinance.
  - a. The subject application is in conformance with the requirements of Sections 27-473 and 27-441, which govern respectively the permitted uses in the industrial and residential zones. The proposal is a permitted use in the I-3 and R-R Zone as amended by CB-65-2003 to allow the proposed use in the I-3 Zone.

Below, each requirement of CB-65-2003 is listed in bold face type, followed by staff comment. The bill further provides that:

**(A) The property must be located on and inside the Capital Beltway at an existing interchange with the Beltway.**

Urban Design Staff Comment: The subject property is located immediately adjacent to and inside the Beltway at the Ritchie Marlboro Road interchange. Therefore, the subject application meets the above requirement of CB-65-2003.

**(B) The site must contain a minimum of 80 acres that is split-zoned I-3 and R-R, with not more than 20% zoned R-R.**

Urban Design Staff Comment: The site measures 101.83 acres, well in excess of the required 80 acres. In addition, it is split-zoned I-3 and R-R, with significantly less than 20 percent of the subject property zoned R-R. The subject project meets the above zoning requirement of CB-65-2003.

**(C) The property must be proposed for employment uses in the most recently approved applicable Master Plan:**

Urban Design Staff Comment: As per the applicable 1986 Approved Master Plan and Adopted Sectional Map Amendment for Suitland-District Heights and Vicinity, Planning Areas 75A and 75B, the property is slated for “employment” land use.

**(D) A Detailed Site Plan must be approved in accordance with Part 3, Division 9, of the Zoning Ordinance.**

Urban Design Staff Comment: If the subject detailed site plan is approved by the Planning Board, this requirement of CB-65-2003 would be fulfilled.

**(E) The site plan shall contain at least two stores containing 100,000 square feet or more of gross floor area.**

Urban Design Staff Comment: The Sam’s Club included in the subject proposal measures 135,441 square feet, well in excess of the required 100,000 square feet and a recommended condition below would require that at least one other store in the subject development measure a minimum of 100,000 square feet as required by CB-65-2003.

- b. The proposal is also in conformance with the requirements of Section 27-474 and 27-442, Regulations, regarding additional regulations for development in industrial and residential zones, respectively..

8. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, 4-04184:** Preliminary Plan 4-04184 was approved for the site on May 12, 2005. Resolution No. 05-115, formalizing that approval, was adopted on July 14, 2005. The following conditions of approval are relevant to the subject detailed site plan. Each condition is listed in bold face type followed by staff’s comments:

1. **Ritchie Marlboro Road at Ritchie Station Court: Prior to the issuance of any**

**building permits within the subject property other than for an information/leasing center, the following road improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances, (b) have been permitted for construction with DPW&T/SHA, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with DPW&T/SHA:**

- a. **Along the westbound approach of Ritchie Marlboro Road, modify the median to provide two (2) exclusive left-turn lanes into the subject site.**
- b. **Along the northbound approach of Ritchie Station Court exiting the subject site, provide an exclusive left-turn lane, a shared through/left-turn lane, and two (2) exclusive channelized right-turn lanes under signalized stop-control.**
- c. **Along the eastbound approach of Ritchie Marlboro Road, provide an exclusive channelized right-turn lane entering the subject site.**
- d. **Prior to approval of the initial Detailed Site Plan proposing development on the site, the applicant shall complete a traffic signal warrant analysis, considering existing and future traffic conditions. If a signal is determined to be warranted by the responsible transportation agency, the applicant shall fund said traffic signal at the time of building permit with installation prior to issuance of the initial use and occupancy permit. This signalization shall include loop detectors and queue detectors as determined to be necessary by DPW&T and/or SHA.**
- e. **Items (a) through (d) above shall include all signage and pavement markings as determined to be necessary by DPW&T and/or SHA.**
- f. **The scope of improvements required by this condition may be modified if needed to achieve all State and Federal approvals, as indicated in Condition 3.**

Comment: In comments dated March 20, 2006, the Transportation Planning Section stated that this condition requires improvements at Ritchie Marlboro Road and Ritchie Station Court. This condition is generally enforceable at the time of building permit, and the condition will be enforced at that time. However, Condition 1D also requires submittal of a traffic signal warrant analysis prior to approval of the detailed site plan. The study has been submitted, and a signal will be installed at this location.

2. **I-95/I-495/Ritchie Marlboro Road Interchange (Roundabouts): Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property other than for an information/leasing center, the following road improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances, (b) have been permitted for construction with DPW&T/SHA, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with DPW&T/SHA:**

- a. ***Western Roundabout (at the ramps to/from the inner loop of the Capital***

***Beltway):*** Modify the westbound roadway between the bridge overpass and the roundabout to provide for transition into three (3) lanes and continuing as three (3) lanes within the affected portion of the circulating roadway of the roundabout, with appropriate overhead signage and pavement markings to delineate the required movements. This improvement would provide for one (1) additional approach lane and one (1) additional circulating lane over the existing situation. Also, modify the eastbound approach between the site entrance and the roundabout to provide three (3) through lanes and continuing as three (3) lanes within the affected portion of the circulating roadway of the roundabout, and transitioning into two (2) eastbound lanes prior to the bridge overpass, with appropriate overhead signage and pavement markings to delineate the required movements.

- b. ***Eastern Roundabout (at the ramps to/from the outer loop of the Capital Beltway):*** Modify the eastbound approach between the bridge overpass and the roundabout to provide for transition into three (3) lanes and continuing as three (3) lanes within the affected portion of the circulating roadway of the roundabout, with appropriate overhead signage and pavement markings to delineate the required movements. This would provide for one (1) additional approach lane and one (1) additional circulating lane over the existing situation.
- c. **The scope of improvements required by this condition may be modified if needed to achieve all State and Federal approvals, as indicated in Condition 3.**

Comment: As per Transportation Planning Section's comments dated March 20, 2006, the transportation improvements required by Condition 2 are enforceable at the time of building permit issuance and this condition will be enforced at that time.

- 3. **The scope of improvements to the I-95/I-495/Ritchie Marlboro Road Interchange and the Ritchie Marlboro Road/Ritchie Station Court intersection may be modified by SHA through discussions with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) as a part of the Interstate Access Point Approval (IAPA) process. Therefore, prior to approval of the initial Detailed Site Plan proposing development on the site, the transportation staff shall confirm the final scope of improvements in consultation with the applicant, DPW&T, and SHA. All improvements shall have approval of the operating agencies, and improvements to the I-95/I-495/Ritchie Marlboro Road interchange shall have IAPA approval by FHWA. A timetable for completion of these improvements shall be provided at the same time.**

Comment: In comments dated March 20, 2006, the Transportation Planning Section stated that this condition requires that the final scope of improvements to the I-95/I-495/Ritchie Marlboro Road interchange and the Ritchie Marlboro Road/Ritchie

Station Court intersection must be confirmed in consultation with the applicant, DPW&T, and SHA. It requires further that improvements to the I-95/I-495/Ritchie Marlboro Road interchange shall have Interstate Access Point Approval (IAPA), approval by Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and that a timetable for completion of these improvements shall be provided. All must happen prior to DSP approval. No such documentation was initially received with the detailed site plan. Since the initial comments, however, they noted that the following had occurred:

- a. The conceptual scope of improvements had been confirmed with DPW&T.
  - b. Several meetings had occurred involving possible approval of improvements to the I-95/I-495/Ritchie Marlboro Road interchange. FHWA had requested the submittal of additional data, and the applicant had submitted this data. All information is currently under review within SHA in preparation for a meeting between FHWA and SHA on March 31, 2006. Given that all the needed information has been submitted, representatives of SHA have suggested that FHWA could make a determination regarding IAPA (Interstate Access Point Approval) shortly after that meeting. In order to satisfy the condition, the Transportation Planning Section recommended that the final IAPA be obtained prior to signature approval of the detailed site plan.
  - c. Regarding a timetable for completion of the needed roadway improvements, the applicant had proffered that all improvements should be complete and open to traffic prior to the granting of the initial use permit under the subject detailed site plan.
4. **At the time of final plat approval, the applicant shall dedicate the right-of-way for Ritchie Station Court as shown on the submitted subdivision plan. Improvements within the dedicated right-of-way, including the roadway lane configuration, markings, signage, pedestrian/transit amenities, and traffic control shall be determined by DPW&T in consultation with Transportation Planning Section staff as part of the review of the initial Detailed Site Plan proposing development on the site.**

Comment: Comments from DPW&T dated March 20, 2006, stated that this condition, in part, that the roadway lane configuration, markings, signage, pedestrian/transit amenities, and traffic control shall be determined by DPW&T in consultation with Transportation Planning Section staff prior to Detailed Site Plan approval. Staff has met with the applicant and DPW&T, and the scope of improvements is acceptable.

5. **Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision, the plan shall be revised to show a parcel extending from the end of Ritchie Station Court to the southern end of the subject property. This parcel shall be a minimum 70 feet in width to allow the future construction of the master plan road to DPW&T standards, and shall be publicly dedicated upon request by DPW&T. This easement**

**may be used for parking and circulation associated with the parking compound as long as it does not impede the future use of the master plan road. The applicant shall also dedicate all needed slope and drainage easements associated with the master plan road extension on the site upon request of DPW&T, provided a construction schedule is established to ensure the completion of the master plan road south to D'Arcy Road. This easement shall be extinguished if the master plan road is removed by a subsequent master plan document.**

Comment: In comments dated March 20, 2006, the Transportation Planning Section stated that this condition requires that the final approved preliminary plan reflect a parcel for a future master plan roadway from the end of Ritchie Station Court to the southern boundary of the site and that this is being completed. However, they stated, the plan raises an issue by placing a sign and a wall within this parcel—and technically within the designated right-of-way for the extension of Hampton Park Boulevard. Therefore, they recommended that these structures be moved outside of the right-of-way by moving them outside of the parcel. This recommendation has been included in the recommended conditions below.

- 6. Total development within the subject property shall be limited to 1,000,000 square feet of retail space, or equivalent development which generates no more than 554 AM and 1,802 PM new peak hour vehicle trips. Any development generating an impact greater than that identified herein above shall require a new preliminary plan of subdivision with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities.**

Comment: In their comments dated March 20, 2006, the Transportation Planning Section stated that since preliminary plan Condition 6 set a trip cap based on 1,000,000 square feet of retail space, and the subject plan proposes only 135,441 square feet of retail space, and the project therefore is in conformance with this condition.

- 9. *Landscape Manual:*** The proposed development is subject to the requirements of Section 4.2 Commercial and Industrial Landscaped Strip requirements, 4.3 Parking Lot Requirements, and 4.7 Buffering Incompatible Uses.

The Urban Design staff reviewed the proposed landscape plan and found that the submittals are in general compliance with the applicable sections of the *Landscape Manual*.

- 10. *Woodland Conservation Ordinance:*** The property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because the site has a previously approved TCP. A Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/203/91-02, was approved for the site together with the detailed site plan for infrastructure. The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed that TCPII and stated that it must be revised in conformance with the comments made on the TCPI to be in conformance with the Woodland Conservation Ordinance. The Environmental

Planning Section's comments are included in the recommendation section of this report and are required to be complied with prior to signature approval of the plans. Therefore, it may be said that the subject project is in conformance with the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance.

11. **Referral Comments:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:

**Historic Preservation**—In comments dated July 13, 2005, the Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section stated that the proposed project would have no effect on historic resources.

**Archeology**—In a memorandum dated August 1, 2005, the archeology consultant stated that she would not recommend a Phase I archeological survey. She noted, however, that:

- Section 106 review may be required by state or federal agencies.
- A portion of Archeological Site 18PR605, a portion of the Chesapeake Beach Railroad, a late-nineteenth-to early twentieth-century railroad, runs southeast-northwest through the north portion of the property.

**Community Planning**—In a memorandum dated August 9, 2005, the Community Planning Division stated:

- The proposed application is not inconsistent with the 2002 approved General Plan development pattern policies for the Developed Tier.
- The proposed project is not in conformance with the land use recommendations of the 1986 *Suitland-District Heights and Vicinity Approved Master Plan and Adopted Sectional Map Amendment*. However, CB-65-2003 amended the residential and industrial zones use tables of the Zoning Ordinance to permit retail uses, generally permitted in the C-S-C Zone, or in the R-R and I-3 Zones, under certain circumstances.
- The proposed development is at a prominent location. It should adhere to the 2002 General Plan design guidelines for the Developed Tier and the master plan's site design guidelines.

**Transportation**—In a revised memorandum dated March 20, 2006, the Transportation Planning Section has stated the following:

There is an approved subdivision for the site, Preliminary Plan 4-04184. There are several transportation-related conditions on the underlying subdivision, and the status of these conditions are summarized below:



4-04184:

- Condition 1: OK. Requires improvements at Ritchie Marlboro Road and Ritchie Station Court. This condition is generally enforceable at the time of building permit, and this condition will be enforced at that time. However, Condition 1D also requires submittal of a traffic signal warrant analysis prior to approval of the Detailed Site Plan. The study has been submitted, and a signal will be installed at this location.
- Condition 2: OK. The required transportation improvements are enforceable at the time of building permit, and this condition will be enforced at that time.
- Condition 3: OK. This condition requires that the final scope of improvements to the I-95/I-495/Ritchie Marlboro Road Interchange and the Ritchie Marlboro Road/Ritchie Station Court intersection must be confirmed in consultation with the applicant, DPW&T, and SHA. It requires further that improvements to the I-95/I-495/Ritchie Marlboro Road interchange shall have IAPA approval by FHWA, and that a timetable for completion of these improvements shall be provided. All must happen prior to DSP approval. No such documentation was initially received with the Detailed Site Plan. Since the initial comments, the following has occurred:
- a. The conceptual scope of improvements has been confirmed with DPW&T.
  - b. Several meetings have occurred involving possible approval of improvements to the I-95/I-495/Ritchie Marlboro Road interchange. FHWA has requested the submittal of additional data, and the applicant has submitted this data. All information is currently under review within SHA in preparation for a meeting between FHWA and SHA on March 31, 2006. Given that all needed information has been submitted, representatives of SHA have suggested that FHWA could make a determination regarding IAPA (Interstate Access Point Approval) shortly after that meeting. In order to satisfy the condition, it is recommended that the final IAPA be obtained prior to signature approval of the Detailed Site Plan.
  - c. Regarding a timetable for completion of the needed roadway improvements, the applicant has proffered that all improvements should be complete and open to traffic prior to the granting of the initial use permit under this detailed site plan.
- Condition 4: OK. This condition, in part, that the roadway lane configuration, markings, signage, pedestrian/transit amenities, and traffic control shall be determined by

DPW&T in consultation with Transportation Planning Section staff prior to Detailed Site Plan approval. Staff has met with the applicant and DPW&T, and the scope of improvements is acceptable.

- Condition 5: OK. This condition requires that the final approved preliminary plan reflects a parcel for a future master plan roadway from the end of Ritchie Station Court to the southern boundary of the site. This is being completed. However, the plan raises an issue by placing a sign and a wall within this parcel—and technically within the designated right-of-way for the extension of Hampton Park Boulevard. It is recommended that these structures be moved outside of the right-of-way by moving them outside of the parcel.
- Condition 6: OK. This condition sets a trip cap based upon 1,000,000 square feet of retail space. The subject plan proposes 135,441 square feet of retail space. No other square footage is currently approved or pending. Therefore, there is conformance with this condition.

Vehicular and pedestrian access within the site is acceptable.

The subject property was the subject of 2004 and 2005 traffic studies and was given subdivision approval pursuant to a finding of adequate transportation facilities made in 2005 for Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04184. That preliminary plan was based upon uses generating 1,120 AM and 1,167 PM peak-hour trips. In consideration of the materials discussed earlier in this memorandum, the transportation staff finds that the subject property will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with transportation facilities that exist, programmed, or which will be provided as a part of the development if the development is approved. This determination is conditional upon the following:

1. Demonstration of final IAPA approval by the FHWA shall be provided prior to signature approval of the detailed site plan.
2. All improvements as generally detailed in Conditions 1 and 2 of Planning Board resolution PGCPB No. 05-115 shall be complete and open to traffic prior to the granting of the initial use permit under this detailed site plan.
3. The detailed site plan shall be revised to move all signs and walls from within the area labeled “Future Master Planned Road Easement.” In accordance with the preliminary plan condition, the area may be utilized for parking and circulation functions.

**Subdivision**—In comments dated February 9, 2006, the Subdivision Section stated that the property is the subject of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04184, approved by the Planning Board on May 12, 2005. The applicable resolution of approval, PGCPB Resolution 05-115, was adopted by the Planning Board on July 14, 2005. The preliminary plan remains valid until July

14, 2007, or until a final record plat is approved. Further, the Subdivision Section stated that the property is subject to the 20 conditions contained in that resolution, specifically conditions 1.d and 3. Please see Finding 8 for further discussion of those conditions. In addition, the Subdivision Section made the following plan comments:

- a. The site plan shows, but does not label, a 70-foot-wide easement for a future master plan road extending from the end of Ritchie Station Court south along the southeast perimeter of the site, adjacent to the Capital Beltway. Numerous signs and the proposed perimeter wall are shown within this easement. This is in direct contradiction of Condition 5 of the resolution, which states:

“This easement may be used for parking and circulation associated with the parking compound as long as it does not impede the future use of the master plan road.”

Because the erection of the signs and perimeter wall would affect the ability for this road to be constructed in the future, either they or the easement must be relocated. They noted, however, that Condition 5 also contains language that calls for the easement to be extinguished if the master plan road is removed in a subsequent master plan document. Recommended Condition 1(g.) below addresses this concern.

**Trails**— In a memorandum dated August 9, 2005, the senior trails planner recommended that standard sidewalks be provided along at least one side of both entrance roads from Ritchie Station Court to the Sam’s Club and that at least one internal sidewalk or designated walkway within the parking lot be provided as safe, separate pedestrian circulation from the parking lot to the store entrance. He suggested that the walkway(s) be marked and labeled on the approved detailed site plan. The senior trails planner’s recommendations have been reflected in the recommended conditions below.

**Permits**— In a memorandum dated August 1, 2005, the Permit Review Section offered numerous comments that required revisions to the plans. The Permit Review Section’s comments have either been addressed by revision to the plans or in the recommended conditions below.

**Environmental Planning**—In comments dated August 25, 2005, the Environmental Planning Section offered the following:

- a. The subject property was harvested using a clear-cut method within the last year. A Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/203/91, was originally approved for the timber harvest and this plan was revised in October 2004. This TCPII covers a land area of 120.57 acres. The FSD submitted also covers 120.57 acres. The current acreage of the site has been revised to read 120.55 acres; however, the current application covers only 101.83 acres as illustrated with tables shown on the plan. The Forest Stand Delineation was

found to be in compliance with the Prince George's Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation technical Manual.

Comment: No additional information is needed with regard to the Forest Stand Delineation, 2005.

- b. The property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because the site has a previously approved TCP. A Type II Tree Conservation Plan was submitted and was found to require minor revisions prior to certificate approval. The Type II Tree Conservation Plan as submitted is not the most current. The TCPI is still pending signature approval. The TCPII must be revised in conformance with the comments made on TCPI and to be in conformance with the Woodland Conservation Ordinance.

The TCPII needs to be revised to include the different zones and correct the worksheet accordingly in conformance with the TCPI.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certification of the detailed site plan the TCPII shall be revised as follows:

- (1) Address all comments on the TCPI on the TCPII.
  - (2) Add standard TCPII notes.
  - (3) Add to note regarding what areas are subject to a forest conservation plan reviewed by Department of Natural Resources.
  - (4) Revise the TCP to include the different zones and correct the worksheet accordingly.
  - (5) When all the revisions have been completed, have the plan reviewed, sealed, signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.
- c. A Stormwater Management Concept Approval Letter (6076-2001-00) dated July 22, 2004, was submitted with the preliminary plan. The approval letter contains several conditions of approval. The DSP must reflect all the required information and facilities. Requirements for stormwater management will be met through subsequent reviews by the Department of Environmental Resources.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certification of the DSP, all required information and stormwater management facilities shall be shown on the DSP and the TCPII.

- d. The Subdivision Ordinance requires the protection of streams, 50-foot stream buffers,

wetlands, 25-foot wetland buffers, 100-year floodplain, adjacent areas of slopes in excess of 25 percent, and adjacent areas of slopes between 15 and 25 percent with highly erodible soils. When a property is located within the Patuxent River watershed these features along with areas of special wildlife habitat compose the Patuxent River Primary Management Area (PMA), which is to be protected to the fullest extent possible.

The PMA delineation is shown differently on the TCPI and the TCPII. The TCPII must be revised to show the PMA delineation that is shown on the TCPI.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certificate approval, the TCPII shall be revised to reflect the correct PMA delineation as shown on the TCPI. The note shall be revised to eliminate the words “jurisdictional determination” and replace them with “wetlands delineation.”

- e. Noise is a consideration in the review of this proposal due to proximity of the residential portion of the subject property to I-95. Because the site is zoned I-1 and the uses proposed are not residential in nature, it is not likely that the noise levels generated will be above the state noise standards for these uses. Based on projected traffic (average daily traffic or ADT projected 10 years) data supplied by the State of Maryland, the Environmental Planning Section noise model has projected that the 65 dBA (Ldn) noise contour is located 1,199 feet from the centerline of the roadway.

The plans as submitted show the 65 dBA (Ldn) noise contour as required. No further action is required at this time with regard to noise contour delineation.

Recommended Condition: Prior to the issuance of permits for any residential-type uses within the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour shown on the plans, noise impacts will be evaluated and addressed. Outdoor activity areas will be mitigated to 65 dBA Ldn or less and interior areas shall be mitigated to 45 dBA Ldn or less.

#### Summary of Recommended Conditions

- a. Prior to certification of the Detailed Site Plan the TCP II shall be revised as follows:
  - (1) Address all comments on the TCPI on the TCPII.
  - (2) Add standard TCPII notes.
  - (3) Add to note regarding what areas are subject to a forest conservation plan reviewed by Department of Natural Resources.

- (4) Revise the TCP to include the different zones and correct the worksheet accordingly.
  - (5) When all the revisions have been completed, have the plan reviewed, sealed, signed and dated by a qualified professional who prepared the plan
- b. Prior to certification of the DSP, all required information and stormwater management facilities shall be shown on the DSP and the TCPII.
- c. Prior to certificate approval, the TCPII shall be revised to reflect the correct PMA delineation as shown on the TCPI. The note shall be revised to eliminate the words “jurisdictional determination” and replace them with “wetlands delineation.”
- d. Prior to certificate approval, the TCPII shall be revised to reflect the correct PMA delineation as shown on the TCPI. The note shall be revised to eliminate the words “jurisdictional determination” and replace them with “wetlands delineation.”
- e. Prior to the issuance of permits for any residential-type uses within the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour shown on the plans, noise impacts will be evaluated and addressed. Outdoor activity areas will be mitigated to 65 dBA Ldn or less and interior areas shall be mitigated to 45 dBA Ldn or less.

The Environmental Planning Section’s recommended conditions regarding environmental issues connected with the project have been included in the recommendation section of this report.

**Department of Environmental Resources (DER)**—In comments dated August 3, 2005, DER stated that the site plan for Ritchie Hill/Sam’s Club, DSP-04080/01, is consistent with approved stormwater management concept plan 19661-2005.

**Fire Department**—In comments dated August 14, 2005, the Prince George’s Fire/EMS Department offered information regarding required access for fire apparatuses, design of private roads, and the location and performance of fire hydrants.

**Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T)**— In a memorandum dated August 18, 2005, DPW&T stated:

- Right-of-way dedication and frontage improvements in accordance with DPW&T’s urban arterial road standards are required for Ritchie Marlboro Road.
- Right-of-way dedication and frontage improvements in accordance with DPW&T’s urban industrial road standards are required for Hampton Park Boulevard.
- Right-of-way dedication and frontage improvements in accordance with DPW&T’s specifications and standards are required for any proposed internal subdivision streets.

- A revision to show a parcel extending from the end of Ritchie Station Court to the southern end of the property is required. Width of the parcel must be a minimum of 70 feet to allow for the future construction of the master plan road according to DPW&T standards and shall be publicly dedicated upon request by DPW&T. This easement may be used for parking and circulation associated with the parking compound, as long as it does not impede the future use of the master plan road. The applicant must also dedicate all needed slope and drainage easements associated with the master plan road extension on the site upon the request of DPW&T, provided a construction schedule is established to ensure the completion of the master plan road south to D'Arcy Road. Such easements will be extinguished if the master plan road is removed by a subsequent master plan.
- Full-width, two-inch mill and overlay for all county roadway frontages is required.
- Conformance with DPW&T street tree and street lighting standards is required.
- Sidewalks are required along all roadways within the property limits in accordance with Sections 23-105 and 23-135 of the county Road Ordinance.
- All storm drainage systems and facilities are to be in accordance with DPW&T and the Department of Environmental Resources requirements.
- An access study shall be conducted by the applicant and reviewed to determine the adequacy of access point(s) and the need for acceleration/deceleration and turning lanes.
- A soils investigation report, which includes subsurface exploration and a geotechnical engineering evaluation for public streets, is required.

Please note that DPW&T's requirements are enforced through their separate permitting process.

**State Highway Administration (SHA)**—In an e-mail dated March 14, 2006, SHA stated that their office had completed its review of the plan and supporting information and had no objection to Detailed Site Plan DSP-04080/01 approval. Further, they requested that their remarks be included in the technical staff report to be presented to the Planning Board.

**Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)**—In a memorandum dated July 29, 2005, WSSC stated:

- Water and sewer extension will be required.
- An on-site plan review package should be submitted.
- Project #DA4125 is an approved project within the limits of this proposed site.

- It appears that the proposed water main is in conflict with storm drain and curbing on Parcel 2. They asked that the applicant delineate all right-of-way easements for public mains on the property and off-site. They stipulated that the storm drain inlets must be outside of the WSSC easements and asked that the applicant differentiate between public mains versus on-site piping on the plans by labeling or changing line weights. They asked that the applicant note that special design considerations apply for the 12-inch water main on Parcel 4 crossing under a retaining wall and the sewer outfall on Parcel 2. Also, they noted that the proposed six-inch, on-site sewer and grease separator impacted the proposed storm drain pipeline and structure and asked that the applicant maintain a five-foot clearance. Please note that WSSC's requirements will be addressed through their separate permitting process.
12. The proposed project fulfills the requirements of Section 27-285(b) of the Zoning Ordinance, i.e., that 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 (TCP/II/203/91-02) and further APPROVED Detailed Site Plan DSP-04081/01 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certification of the subject detailed site plan the plans shall be revised or additional materials submitted as follows:
  - a. Standard sidewalk shall be shown along both sides of Ritchie Station Court subject to the approval of the Department of Public Works and Transportation.
  - b. Standard sidewalk shall be shown along both sides of the private roads leading from Ritchie Station Court to the Sam's Club.
  - c. At least one internal sidewalk or designated walkway within the parking lot shall be marked and labeled on the approved detailed site plan in order to provide safe separate pedestrian circulation from the parking lot to the store entrance.
  - d. A note shall be added to the plans that the "coming soon" banner shall be removed by the time a certificate of use and occupancy is granted to the proposed project.
  - e. All required information and stormwater management facilities shall be shown on the detailed site plan.
  - f. Demonstration of final Interstate Access Point Approval by the Federal Highway



Administration shall be provided.

- g. All signs and walls shall be moved from the area labeled "Future Master Planned Road Easement" and a note shall be added to the plan that the Future Master Planned Road Easement may only be utilized for parking and circulation functions.
  - h. A note shall be added to the plans stating that pursuant to CB-65-2003 at least one other store in the subject integrated shopping center shall measure a minimum of 100,000 square feet.
  - i. Applicant shall provide one legible overall site plan for the entire land area included in the application at a 1:100 scale showing zoning and demarcation between I-3 and R-R zoning, adjacent streets, bearings and distances that conforms to 4-04184. Scale may be reduced slightly only as necessary to include the plan on a single sheet.
  - j. The following items shall be clearly indicated on the 1:50 scale landscape and detailed site plan:
    - (1) Zoning of I-3 and R-R and demarcation between the two shall be clearly indicated.
    - (2) Zoning and use of all adjacent parcels and lots.
    - (3) Structures and which ones will be razed.
    - (4) Dimensions from building to all property lines.
    - (5) Dumpster and screening.
    - (6) Height, top, bottom and overall for each retaining wall.
    - (7) Ultimate right-of-way information.
    - (8) Height of building.
    - (9) Demonstration of conformance with setback requirements.
    - (10) Dimension of regular, compact, accessible and van accessible parking spaces.
    - (11) Dimension and label the loading spaces.
    - (12) Dimension the width of all perimeter-landscaped areas.
2. Prior to certification of the subject Type II tree conservation plan, applicant shall revise the plans or submit additional documentation as follows:

- a. Address all comments on the TCPI on the TCPII.
  - b. Add standard TCPII notes.
  - c. Add a note to the plans regarding what areas are subject to a Forest Conservation Plan reviewed by the Department of Natural Resources.
  - d. Revise the TCP to include the different zones and correct the worksheet accordingly.
  - e. When all the revisions have been completed, have the plan reviewed, sealed, signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.
  - f. All required information and stormwater management facilities shall be shown on the TCPII.
  - g. The TCPII shall be revised to reflect the correct PMA delineation as shown on the TCPI. The note shall be revised to eliminate the words "jurisdictional determination" and replace them with "wetlands delineation."
3. Prior to the issuance of permits for any residential-type uses within the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour shown on the plans, noise impacts will be evaluated and addressed. Outdoor activity areas will be mitigated to 65 dBA Ldn or less and interior areas shall be mitigated to 45 dBA Ldn or less.
  4. Prior to the granting of the initial use permit under this detailed site plan, all improvements as generally detailed in Conditions 1 and 2 of Planning Board resolution PGCCPB No. 05-115 shall be complete and open to traffic.
  5. Signage for the subject project shall be limited to signage approved herewith, as potentially modified by Departure from Design Standards, DSDS-634.

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 Clark, seconded by Commissioner Eley, with Commissioners Clark, Eley, Vaughns and Parker voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioner Squire absent at its regular meeting held on Thursday, March 30, 2006, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 20<sup>th</sup> day of April 2006.

Trudye Morgan Johnson  
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin  
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:RG:bjs