

RESOLUTION

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 18, 2008, regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-84075/04 for Beech Road Storage, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The subject application requests approval of a 113,276-square-foot consolidated storage facility.

2. **Development Data Summary:**

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone(s)	I-1	I-1
Use(s)	Vacant	Consolidated Storage Facility
Acreage	5.2806	5.2806
Building square footage/GFA	0	113,276

## OTHER DEVELOPMENT DATA

PARKING SPACES	REQUIRED	PROPOSED
Storage – 1,026 @ 1/50 units	21	21
Office 1,200 square feet @ 1/250 square feet	5	5
Residential Unit	2	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Of which are designed for use of the handicapped</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
Total Loading Spaces	5	5

3. **Location:** The subject property is located on the southeastern side of Beech Road, approximately 300 feet southwest of its intersection with Branch Avenue (MD 5).
4. **Surrounding Uses:** The subject property is bounded to the east by the Henson Creek Stream Valley Park; to the south by another industrial use in the Silver Hill Industrial Center; to the north by a retail bank, also in the Silver Hill Industrial Center; and by vacant land and a retail use directly across Beech Road.

5. **Previous Approvals:** The project is the subject of Final Plat VJ 181 @76 and Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-96016. The project is also subject to the requirements of Zoning Map Amendment A-9457.
6. **Design Features:** The project is accessed at two points from the project's Beech Road frontage. The northern access leads into a parking area and to a drive which connects at the rear of the building to a second parking area at the building's southern end. Parallel parking at the rear of the building adds an additional ten spaces. The building footprint measures 28,319 square feet, although because of its four-story height, its total square footage is 113,276.

Architectural design for the project includes a variety of well-organized rectilinear forms and fenestration. The ends and midsection of the front elevation are treated with a reddish-brown face brick and are articulated by two levels of paired windows, an entry door on the northern end of the façade, and a flat roofline with an exterior insulation finish system (EIFS) cornice. The spans between the brick components of the front façade, which has a lower flat roofline, are treated in two colors of EIFS with more restrained fenestration (only two sets of paired windows on each) than on the bricked elements and a pre-finished metal cap flashing in hunter green with a yellow accent pin stripe.

The rear elevation of the building includes beige metal siding with a band of hunter green metal siding on the top ten feet of the façade. Fenestration on this façade includes a central entrance door, two additional pedestrian entrance doors at either end of the façade, and approximately 23 roll-up doors in a hunter green color. Three pre-finished metal canopies with suspension cables in a hunter green color with a yellow pinstripe are provided in the center and near the two ends of the façades. An accent pin strip in white is provided under the green upper portion of the façade and above the doors. The rear of the parapet from the front façade is visible from the rear. A retaining wall with decorative fencing is provided at each end of the façade and the color of that façade is coordinated with the beige metal siding.

The side elevations are clad primarily in brick, with EIFS accents and include some balanced fenestration. Each façade includes two hunter green roll-up doors to provide direct access to units. Two pre-finished metal canopies with suspension cables in a hunter green finish with a yellow pin stripe are provided on each end. Building-mounted signage stating "Storage Zone" and including the company's lock motif are included on each façade.

7. **Zoning Ordinance:** The subject application has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements in the I-1 (Light Industrial) Zone. The project is in compliance with the applicable provisions of Section 27-473, Uses Permitted in Industrial Zones, and the applicable provisions of Section 27-474, Regulations for Development in Industrial Zones. The application has also been evaluated against the requirements of Section 27-475.04, Consolidated Storage. Each applicable requirement of Section 27-475.04 is located in bold face type below, followed by comment.

(a) **Beginning June 23, 1988, a Detailed Site Plan shall be approved for consolidated storage developments in accordance with Part 3, Division 9, of**

**this Subtitle to insure compliance with the provisions of this Section. Consolidated storage constructed pursuant to a building permit issued prior to this date; consolidated storage for which grading permits were issued prior to this date, subject to Subsection (b); and consolidated storage for which applications for building permits were filed on September 22, 1987, and which are actively pending as of October 25, 1988, subject to Subsection (b), need not meet these requirements.**

Should the subject detailed site plan be approved for the project, this requirement will be complied with. The subject application does not fit within the listed exemptions above. Therefore, a detailed site plan is required.

**(1) Requirements.**

- (A) No entrances to individual consolidated storage units shall be visible from a street or from adjoining land in any Residential or Commercial Zone (or land proposed to be used for residential or commercial purposes on an approved Basic Plan for a Comprehensive Design Zone, or any approved Conceptual or Detailed Site Plan).**

Two entrances are visible on the side elevations from Beech Road. However, no entrances are visible from adjoining land in any residential or commercial zone, or from land proposed to be used for residential or commercial purposes on an approved basic plan for a comprehensive design zone, or any approved conceptual or detailed site plan. The entrances to the individual units are otherwise located internally to the building. A correction to the plans to eliminate the roll-up doors on the side elevations is included in the recommendation section of this report.

- (B) Entrances to individual consolidated storage units shall be either oriented toward the interior of the development or completely screened from view by a solid wall, with landscaping along the outside thereof.**

The two roll-up doors that would be visible from Beech Road are required to be eliminated or completely screened by the proposed condition below.

- (C) The maximum height shall be thirty-six (36) feet. Structures exceeding this height and approved before January 1, 2000, shall not be considered nonconforming.**

The maximum height of the proposed structure is 34 feet, which is within the above-stated maximum height requirement of 36 feet.

8. **Zoning Map Amendment A-9457:** The proposed project is subject to the requirements of ZMA A-9457. Each relevant condition of that approval is listed below in bold face type, followed by comment:

1. **Prior to issuance of grading, building, or use and occupancy permits for the subject property, a site plan of development shall be submitted to the Planning Board for its review and approval. This site plan shall indicate compliance with all conditions in this Ordinance.**

The subject detailed site plan has been submitted to the Planning Board for review and approval in accordance with this condition of the rezoning. The site plan has indicated compliance with the conditions of this and the two following conditions of the rezoning.

2. **All development on the subject property shall be of relatively small scale and no building shall be more than three stories in height. All structures erected on the site shall be in scale with the remainder of this site and with existing uses on surrounding properties.**

The development indicated in the submitted detailed site plan application is of relatively small scale, with no building more than three stories in height. Additionally, in compliance with Condition 2 of the rezoning, the proposed structures are in scale with development in the remainder of the Silver Hill Industrial Center and in the vicinity of the subject site.

3. **The façades of structures on the subject property which face Beech Road shall be commercial-office in character and shall not exceed two stories in height.**

Although the structure does not exceed two stories in height in compliance with this condition, its commercial-office character would be enhanced by the addition of brick on the entire first floor of the front of the building. Condition 1(d) of this Resolution satisfies this element of the ZMA condition, concerning the commercial-office character of the proposed structure.

9. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-96016:** The proposed project is subject to the requirements of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-96016 which was approved by the Prince George's County Planning Board (PGCPB) Resolution No. 96-217. The following conditions relate to the review of the detailed site plan:

- Condition 1: Development of this subdivision shall be in accordance with the approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan, Concept No. [sic] 968006210.**

In comments dated September 17, 2008, the Department of Public Works and Transportation stated that the proposed development conforms to the requirements of the approved stormwater management concept plan.

**Condition 5:** Development of Parcel B shall be limited to uses permissible in the I-1 Zone at a scale which would be expected to generate no more than 63 vehicle trips during the AM or PM peak hour using the generation rates in the *Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals* (April 1989).

In comments dated September 3, 2008, the Transportation Planning Section stated that the proposed development falls within the trip generation rates specified in Condition 5 above.

10. **Final Plat NLP 141@11:** In a memorandum dated September 22, 2008, the Subdivision Section stated that the parcels as described on the site plan are consistent with the record plat.
11. **Detailed Site Plans DSP-84075, DSP-84075/01, DSP-84075/02, and DSP-84075/03:** The original detailed site plan for the project was approved November 18, 1984 and three subsequent revisions have been processed for the property. The project is in accord with the requirements of DSP-84075 (approved November 18, 1984 for the Silver Hill Industrial Center, subject to two conditions). Detailed Site Plan DSP-84075/02 (approved May 12, 1995, to reflect the number of units as built, with no conditions), and DSP-84075/03 (approved July 22, 1997 for the installation of a six-foot-high fence, with no conditions). Detailed Site Plan DSP-84075/01 was withdrawn before it was approved.
12. **Prince George's County Landscape Manual:** The project is subject to Sections 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4 of the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*. Staff has reviewed the submitted landscape plan and finds that it meets the requirements of the relevant sections of the Landscape Manual.
13. **Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance:** In a memorandum dated November 7, 2008, the Environmental Planning Section stated that the property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because the site has an approved Type I tree conservation plan. The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed the proposed Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/211/90-01, against the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance and the relevant Type I tree conservation plan and recommended its approval, subject to a single condition that has been included in the recommendation section of this report. Should that condition be adopted as part of the approval of the subject project, it may be said that the project is in conformance with the Woodland Conservation Ordinance.
14. **Referral Comments:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:
  - a. **Historic Preservation**—In comments dated September 3, 2008, the Historic Preservation Section stated that the proposed revision to DSP-84075/04 will have no effect on historic resources.

- b. **Archeology**—In a memorandum dated September 17, 2008, the Archeology Planner Coordinator did not recommend a Phase I archeological survey because a search of current and historic photographs, topographic and historic maps, and locations of currently known archeological sites indicated a low probability of archeological sites within the property and because aerial photographs and topographic data indicated that portions of the site had been previously graded. She stated, however, that the applicant should be aware that there is one historic site, the Ridgeway-Hagen House (76A-1), located within a one-mile radius of the subject property and that there is one previously identified prehistoric archeological site located within a one mile radius of the subject project.
- c. **Community Planning**—In a memorandum dated October 1, 2008, the Community Planning Southwest Section stated that the subject application is not inconsistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies for Developed Tier Centers and that it is in general conformance with the Employment Land Use recommendation of the 2000 *Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Heights and Vicinity (Planning Area 76A)*.
- d. **Transportation**—In comments dated September 3, 2008, the Transportation Planning Section stated that the site plan is acceptable and that there are no master planned transportation facilities that would affect the subject site. Furthermore, they stated that the proposed 110,462 square feet of consolidated storage would generate 17 AM and 29 PM peak-hour trips, which is well within the cap established by Condition 5 of the relevant Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (4-96016).
- e. **Subdivision**—In comments dated September 22, 2008, the Subdivision Section stated that the property is known as Parcel S, recorded in land records in Final Plat VJ 181 @76 in 1997, and that the proposed project is consistent with the record plat. Further, they noted that the project, together with a Parcel R, is subject to the requirements of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-96016, being a re-subdivision of Parcel K. That approval was formalized in PGCPB Resolution No. 96-217, subject to five conditions. Please see Finding 9 for a detailed discussion of the relevant conditions of that approval.
- f. **Trails**—In a memorandum dated October 14, 2008, the Trails Coordinator stated that the relevant adopted and approved Heights master plan includes no master plan trails issues that impact the subject site. Further, he stated that the proposed extension of the Henson Creek Trail is located off the subject site on the adjacent Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) stream valley parkland. He said that he, together with representatives of the Department of Parks and Recreation, had evaluated the feasibility of a trail connection through the subject site from Beech Road to the planned stream valley trail and concluded that, while a connection in the vicinity of the subject site may be necessary for access and as a temporary at-grade crossing, that the most appropriate location for this connection is off the subject property. In closing, he offered support for the planned sidewalk indicated on the detailed site plan along the subject property's Beech Road frontage.

- g. **Parks**—In an email dated October 8, 2008, the Department of Parks and Recreation stated that they reviewed plans for the subject project and that they would have no substantial impact on the adjacent park property.
- h. **Permits**—In a memorandum dated September 16, 2008, the Permit Review Section offered a number of comments that have either been addressed by revisions to the plans or in the recommended conditions below.
- i. **Environmental Planning**—In a memorandum dated November 7, 2008, the Environmental Planning Section offered the following with respect to compliance with the requirements of the previously approved Type I tree conservation plan.

The following text addresses previously approved environmental conditions related to the subject preliminary plan of subdivision and Type I tree conservation plan. The applicable conditions were reviewed for conformance with the current application. The text in **BOLD** is the actual text from the previous cases or plans. The plain text provides comments on the plan's conformance with the applicable conditions.

- 2. **Prior to signature approval of the Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/33/96, the following revisions shall be made to the plan:**
  - a. **All references to the Forest Resources Unit (FRU) should be removed from the Notes. FRU ceased to exist in July 1995.**
  - b. **Credit can be given for afforestation within the floodplain, but not for preservation within the floodplain. For the purposes of the TCP, the floodplain is the areas within the recorded floodplain Easement. The calculations in the Worksheet will need to be adjusted to meet this requirement.**
  - c. **A note should be added to the Worksheet stating: "Fee-in-lieu may be substituted for offsite conservation."**

The above conditions have been addressed.

Further, the Environmental Planning Section offered the following review of the subject detailed site plan and Type II tree conservation plan:

- (1) The site has a forest stand delineation (FSD) that is dated December 5, 1995. Most of the on-site woodland is within the 100-year floodplain and is proposed for preservation with this application. Because the woodland within the developable area is limited on this site, and most of the on-site woodland will be preserved within the 100-year floodplain, an updated FSD is not needed.

**Analysis:** No revisions are required for conformance to the natural resources inventory (NRI).

- (2) The property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because the site has an approved Type I tree conservation plan.

A Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/211/90-01, has been submitted. The woodland conservation threshold for the site is 0.38 acre. The TCPII shows a total woodland conservation requirement of 0.51 acre based on proposed clearing. The plan proposes to meet the requirement with 0.39 acre of on-site woodland preservation and 0.12 acre fee-in-lieu. The proposed woodland preservation areas are adjacent to the wooded 100-year floodplain.

Two technical revisions are required. The DSP and TCP need to be revised to eliminate the proposed tree line. The DSP needs to be revised to show the expanded buffer.

As Condition 1(c) requires, prior to certification of the detailed site plan, the DSP and TCPII shall be revised to remove the proposed tree line from the plans, and the DSP shall be revised to show the expanded buffer on the plan and in the legend.

- (3) A copy of the approved stormwater management concept letter and plan were submitted. The plan proposes two underground storage facilities. The approved concept is correctly reflected on the DSP and TCPII.

**Analysis:** No additional information is required with regard to stormwater management.

The condition suggested by the Environmental Planning Section has been included in the recommendation section of this report.

- j. **Fire Department**—In a letter dated September 26, 2008, the Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department offered information regarding required access for fire apparatus, private road design and the location and performance of fire hydrants.
- k. **Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T)**—In a memorandum dated September 17, 2008, the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) offered the following:
- Frontage improvements in accordance with DPW&T urban commercial and industrial road specifications and standards would be required for Beech Road;
  - Full-width, two-inch mill and overlay for all county roadway frontages would be



required;

- Compliance with DPW&T utility policy would be required. Further, they stated, that based upon the plans submitted, proper temporary and final patching and the related mill and overlay in accordance with the established “DPW&T Policy and Specification for Utility Installation and Maintenance Permits” would be required;
- All storm drainage systems and facilities would be required to be designed in accordance with DPW&T specifications and standards;
- That conformance with DPW&T street tree and street lighting specifications and standards would be required;
- That sidewalks would be required along all roadways within the property limits in accordance with Sections 23-195 and 13-135 of the County Road Ordinance;
- That site development conceptual and technical plan approval would be required;
- That the submitted plan is consistent with the approved Stormwater Management Plan, No. 15-65-2008-00, dated May 27, 2008; and
- That a soils investigation report which includes subsurface exploration and geotechnical engineering evaluation for public streets would be required.

Please note that DPW&T requirements are generally enforced through their separate permitting process.

- l. **Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA)**—In comments received September 5, 2008, the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) stated that they would have no comment on the subject project as its access is on a county owned and maintained road.
- m. **Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)**—In a revised memorandum received November 17, 2008, the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC) stated that an on-site plan review package should be submitted and that the applicant should contact their Permit Services Unit for additional information. Additionally, they stated that the existing eight-inch water line to be relocated is part of an on-site system. Additionally, they stated that the associated 20-foot right-of-way (Final Plat VJ 181 @76) is a privately owned right-of-way for a water main. Therefore, they concluded that the owners of parcels “S” and “R” should enter into a “Shared Site Utility Agreement” which can be obtained from WSSC, Permit Services Unit.
- n. **Verizon**—In an e-mail dated September 18, 2008, Verizon noted a conflict between the ten-foot public utility and the 20-foot WSSC easement.

- o. Potomac Electric Power Company (PEPCO)—In an e-mail dated October 17, 2008, Potomac Electric Power Company (PEPCO) stated the following:

        - The developer should submit a class of service application to Debbie Woodson (Service Coordinator) and Steve Park (Service Engineer) with a load letter and a PDR of the site plan showing the curb cuts, the location of existing poles, and the proposed transformer pad for determination of any relocation of poles required; and
        - The cost of relocation for all utility lines, PEPCO, Verizon and cable will be the responsibility of the owner/developer.
15. As required by Section 27-285(b), 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/211/90-01) and further APPROVED Detailed Site Plan DSP-84075/04 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certificate approval of this detailed site plan, the applicant shall:
  - a. Redesign the building so that the two roll-up doors on both side elevations are eliminated as per Applicant's Exhibits 1 and 2. Alternatively, a combination of a wall and landscaping shall entirely screen the roll-up doors. Such redesign shall be approved by Urban Design staff as designee of the Planning Board.
  - b. The board-on-board fence specified for the dumpster enclosure shall be replaced with a non-wood, non-white durable fence.
  - c. The detailed site plan and the TCPII shall be revised to remove the proposed tree line from the plans, and the detailed site plan shall be revised to show the expanded buffer on the plan and in the legend.
  - d. The entire first floor of the front façade of the proposed building shall be clad in brick.
2. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall furnish proof that all concerns regarding easements for utilities on the site have been addressed to the satisfaction of the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC) and Verizon.

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 Squire, seconded by Commissioner Clark, with Commissioners Squire, Clark, Vaughns, Cavitt and Parker voting in favor of the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, December 18, 2008, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 8<sup>th</sup> day of January 2009.

Oscar S. Rodriguez  
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin  
Planning Board Administrator

OSR:FJ:GRG:bjs