

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 April 12, 2001, regarding Detailed Site Plan SP-99044 for Prince George's Plaza, the Planning Board finds:

1. The Detailed Site Plan is for construction of an anchor store consisting of approximately 151,560 square feet and a pad site consisting of 6,722 square feet in Subarea 11 of the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Overlay Zone. The site consists of approximately 52 acres of land in the C-S-C Zone and is located at the northwest quadrant of the intersection of East West Highway and Belcrest Road. The existing development on the site is Prince George's Plaza Shopping Center, which is an enclosed shopping mall that was developed in the late 1950s and originally consisted of 878,480 square feet. Three pad sites exist as well. This development proposal includes demolishing the existing structure on the east end of the shopping center in order to build a new anchor store. The existing pad site located adjacent to East West Highway is proposed as a renovation and construction of an addition for a restaurant (Outback Steakhouse) on the same pad site.
2. Section 27-548.08(c), Required findings for a Detailed Site Plan in the Transit District Overlay Zone (TDOZ).
 - (1) The Transit District Site Plan is in strict conformance with any Mandatory Development Requirements of the Transit District Development Plan;

Comment: The Detailed Site Plan is not in strict conformance with all of the Mandatory Development Requirements. Mandatory Development Requirements are made up of primary and secondary requirements. The applicant has filed an application for a Primary Amendment (TP-00001) and a Departure from Design Standards (DDS-515) as needed to fulfill their objective of plan approval. The staff analysis and recommendations are contained within the technical staff report for TP-00001 and DDS-515 and are being processed concurrently with this application.

3. The following Mandatory Development Requirements warrant discussion in the review of this Detailed Site Plan application.

DISTRICT-WIDE MANDATORY DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS

P1 Unless otherwise stated within the Subarea Specific Requirements, each developer, applicant, and the applicant's heirs, successors and/or assigns, shall be responsible for streetscape improvements along the entire length of the property frontage from the building envelope to face of curb. (See Figures 7, 8 and 9. Toledo Terrace: 20-foot pedestrian zone; East West Highway: 40-foot pedestrian zone; Belcrest Road: 20-40 foot pedestrian zone.) These improvements shall be included as part of any application for building or grading permits, except for permits for interior alterations which do not constitute redevelopment as defined in the previous chapter. No building or grading permits shall be issued with a Detailed Site Plan which indicates conformance with the streetscape requirements of the TDDP. Construction of the streetscaping improvements shall be in phase with development, or the construction schedule shall be determined at the time of Detailed Site Plan. [Emphasis added]

Comment: This mandatory requirement is the subject of TP-0001, however the last sentence of the Primary Mandatory Requirement above allows for the phasing of the streetscape/pedestrian zone improvements at the time of Detail Site Plan. The applicant has asked for a phasing plan to be approved as part of this Detailed Site Plan. The staff supports a phasing plan but does not agree precisely with the applicant's proposal. The staff has prepared an Exhibit A (attached) to demonstrate the phasing schedule recommended by the staff. Basically, the staff promotes the development of the streetscape/pedestrian zone as a priority within the Transit District. Construction of the plaza at the base of the Metro overpass is equally important (see discussion of P98) as is the connection to the shopping center. Conditions 2, 3 and 4 address the recommended phasing of the streetscape improvements.

P2 All development/redevelopment shall have a sign plan approved by the Planning Board at the time of Detailed site Plan. This plan shall provide the

sign (location(s), size, color, lettering style, construction details and material specifications including the method of illumination).

Comment: Conceptual Site Plan CSP-94023 (PGCPB No. 94-247) was approved by the Planning Board on Thursday, July 21, 1994, which approved a signage plan for the subject site. This approval included standards to ensure consistency for all future signs on the Prince George's Plaza Shopping Center parcel. The signage plan approved in 1994 continues to be valid.

P33 Each Preliminary Plat, Conceptual and/or Detailed Site Plan shall show a 65 dBA (Ldn) noise contour based upon average daily traffic volumes at LOS E. Upon plan submittal, the Natural Resources Division shall determine if a noise study is required based on the delineation of the noise contour.

The Environmental Planning Section, in a memorandum dated March 20, 2001 (Finch to Whitmore), offered the following comment:

■The submitted plan includes a delineation of the 65 dBA noise contour. After review of the plan text, it appears that the more appropriate contour for this commercial use, based on Table 8: Established Noise Standards in Transit District would be the 64 dBA, but the illustrated contour provides sufficient information to determine whether a noise study is necessary.

Comment: The above-referenced mandatory requirement has been fulfilled.

SUBAREA 11 MANDATORY DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS

P92 The minimum building height for structures containing more than three office uses shall be 4 stories except the landmark building referred to in P 94.

Comment: The proposed structures do not contain more than three offices; therefore, this primary amendment does not apply.

P93 The maximum building height shall be 16 stories for all uses.

Comment: The proposed Outback Steakhouse is 20 feet in height. The plans indicate that the height of the proposed anchor and accessory building are ■to be determined• at a later date. At the time of submittal of the Detailed Site Plan for architecture for the above referenced structures, conformance to P93 will be determined.

P95 For structures containing more than three office uses, a build-to line shall be established 40 feet from face of curb along East-West Highway.

Comment: The subject application is not proposing any structures adjacent to East-West Highway that contain more than three office uses; therefore, a 40-foot build-to line need not be established at this time.

P98 An urban plaza with a park-like setting shall be provided in order to create a pedestrian-friendly area at the base of the proposed Metro pedestrian overpass. The plaza shall be constructed concurrently with any development of 5,000 square feet or greater of gross floor area provided that the Metro overpass is completed or under construction. The design of the plaza shall be coordinated with the overpass construction.

Comment: The plans, as submitted, indicate that a pedestrian plaza is being proposed at the base of the Metro tower. The plaza continues north, creating a linear plaza, adjacent to the existing entrance drive and terminates at the southeast corner of the existing shopping center next to the proposed anchor store. The pedestrian plaza, as submitted, includes bus shelters and a bus pull off-area. These buses are to be rerouted to the Metro station, just south of the existing site. The plaza should be redesigned to eliminate the bus shelters and pull-off area.

The plaza details lack specifications which should include but not limited to the following: paving materials, street furniture (benches, trash receptacles, lighting, etc.), landscape-bed edging, fencing and the details for the public art. The plaza at the base of the Metro overpass is required to be constructed in Phase I because the renovation of the existing vacant pad site and the addition exceed 5,000 square feet of gross floor area of development.

4. In addition to the Mandatory Requirements above, the application is also subject to the Secondary Mandatory Development Requirements. The applicant has filed an application for a Secondary Amendment (TS-99044A) as needed to fulfill their objective of plan approval. The staff analysis and recommendations are provided below:

S8 All property frontages shall be improved in accordance with Figures 7, 8 and 9 in order to create a visually continuous and unified streetscape.

In a letter dated November 20, 2000, Linda Ryan to Liz Whitmore, the following justification is given:

■The applicant requests an amendment to use shrubs and shade trees only instead of the opaque wall shown in Figure 7. By using shrubs and shade trees within the pedestrian zone, there will be more room for the plant roots than that allowed by a heavy wall. The plants will also give a softer look than that provided by a wall.

■The applicant requests to provide a 26-foot-wide pedestrian zone instead of the 40-foot zone shown in Figure 8 because there is no build-to line and so the 40-foot zone is not applicable. • [This is the subject of TP-00001 and is provided for informational purposes only.]

The Community Planning Division, in a memorandum dated January 29, 2001, Fisher to Development Review Division, offered the following analysis:

■We recommend that no amendment be granted. The applicant proposes an amendment to S8, specifically *to use shrubs and shade trees only instead of the opaque wall shown in Figure 7.▲ The TDDP requires that ■all property frontages shall be improved in accordance with Figures 7, 8 and 9 in order to create a visually continuous and unified streetscape. The purpose of the opaque wall in combination with the landscape is to provide year-round screening of visible parking lots. Simply adding plants to the pedestrian zone will not provide adequate screening since plants are susceptible to dying and will leave screening voids along the property frontage. A combination of both an opaque wall and landscape plants will provide the optimal requirements as required by the TDDP. In fact, this requirement is repeated throughout the TDDP three different times to guarantee its importance in the planning of the transit district. The applicant will also need to include the appropriate streetscape details, as shown in the TDDP, on the Detailed Site Plan; specifically the pedestrian light standards, the 3.- to 4-inch caliper street trees, as well as planting a double staggered row of trees along the proposed walkway. Therefore, we recommend that no amendment be granted. See also related secondary amendments requests to S23 and S65 below.●

Comment: The applicant's proposal to narrow the width of the streetscape/pedestrian zone is an attempt to save some of the existing surface parking spaces on the property. This issue is the subject of a Primary Amendment and is covered in the technical staff report for TP-00001. However, because of the reduced width proposed by the applicant, this secondary amendment is necessary to adjust the elements within the streetscape so the reduced width can accommodate the pedestrian zone. As of the writing of this report, the design of the streetscape within the proposed 28 feet is still an issue and should be further defined prior to signature approval. The Urban Design staff supports the secondary amendment because 28 feet is wide enough to provide for the elements of the streetscape and provide an aesthetic and unified pedestrian zone harmonious throughout the Transit District. The individual elements within the streetscape should mimic the elements of other subareas within the Transit District, particularly the conceptual design proposed for Prince George's Boulevard in subareas 2 and 3 immediately to the east. However, there are a number of outstanding issues relating to the design of the streetscape. There is a pedestrian and vehicular conflict in the connection of the pedestrian way at the crossing of the right-in-only entrance. This issue should be further investigated and the feasibility of various alternatives, such as speed humps, signage, and reducing the turning radius to slow traffic coming into the shopping center should be examined. Another issue is controlling pedestrians from randomly crossing East West Highway. The staff believes that a fence should be incorporated into the design of the green area between the sidewalk and the curb edge that would prevent people from trying to cross mid-block. Other outstanding issues involving the design of the streetscape include the removal or incorporation of the ATM machine near the Chevy Chase Bank site, the future public art proposal, the elimination of the bus stop along East West Highway and

redesign of that area, the plaza design at the base of the Metro overpass, and the design of the linear plaza. All of these issues should be addressed prior to signature approval. The design is currently drawn at 30 scale and a design plan provided at 10 scale is more appropriate for the review of details and specifications of the streetscape and its interface with the plazas.

S17 All parking lots shall, in general, be located behind buildings, and shall not occupy more than 33 percent of the frontage of any subarea along a pedestrian street.

In a letter dated November 20, 2000, Linda Ryan to Liz Whitmore, the following justification is given:

■The applicant requests an amendment that this requirement be found not applicable because of the existing use of the property as a shopping center. This requirement would apply to a redevelopment scenario in which new office buildings would be constructed (see May 3, 2000, memo from Steve Fisher).•

The Community Planning Division, in memorandum dated January 29, 2001, Fisher to Development Review Division, offered the following analysis:

■We recommend that an amendment be granted if the proposed parking compound is removed adjacent to the main entrance along Belcrest Road; specifically across from the proposed bus shelter location. This parking compound is in contradiction to the requirements of S17 in that it provides parking along the property frontage where parking did not previously exist. The parking compound proposed for re-striping north of the proposed bus shelter location is acceptable due to the fact that this is an existing parking area.●

Comment: The Urban Design Section does not agree with the Community Planning Division that S17 prohibits parking along the property frontage where it did not previously exist. The additional parking compound is orderly and is not objectionable. Considering the loss of parking spaces required to implement the streetscape along East West Highway, the staff is of the opinion that the proposed parking compound will help mitigate the impact of lost parking spaces to the overall center.

S23 All surface parking lots shall be screened from view of roadways by the use of both a low, opaque wall and an evergreen hedge (See Figure 7), unless they are providing short-term parking for ten cars or fewer.

In a letter dated November 20, 2000, Linda Ryan to Liz Whitmore, the following justification is given:

- The applicant requests an amendment to allow the use of an evergreen hedge only for the reason stated in the justification for S8.●

The Community Planning Division, in memorandum dated January 29, 2001, Fisher to Development Review Division, offered the following analysis:

- We recommend that no amendment be granted. The rationale for this recommendation is contained under S8 above.●

The argument is reiterated below for the reader's convenience:

- The purpose of the opaque wall in combination with the landscape is to provide year-round screening of visible parking lots. Simply adding plants to the pedestrian zone will not provide adequate screening since plants are susceptible to dying and will leave screening voids along the property frontage. A combination of both an opaque wall and landscape plants will provide the optimal requirements as required by the TDDP. In fact, this requirement is repeated throughout the TDDP three different times to guarantee its importance in the planning of the transit district.●

Comment: The Urban Design staff recommends that no amendment be granted. The wall concept is required through the Transit District and is a unifying design element. This same requirement is restated in S64, which is one of the subarea requirements (see below). The staff recommends that the low wall be modified to delete the proposed painted concrete masonry block and substitute brick.

S30 All new retail development shall provide four bicycle racks per 10,000 gross square feet of floor space with each rack holding a minimum of 2 bicycles.

The applicant's representative provides the following argument in a letter dated November 20, 2000:

- The applicant requests an amendment to allow bike racks to be relocated around the entire center, and to allow a ratio of 1 bike rack per 100,000 square feet of retail floor space. Bicycle Facility requirement S30, to provide four bike racks for 10,000 square feet of floor space, is excessive for a retail center. In addition, these bike racks should be located adjacent to mall entrances rather than at streetscape plazas based on the anticipated use of these areas.●

The Community Planning Division, in memorandum dated January 29, 2001, Fisher to Development Review Division, offered the following analysis:

- We recommend that an amendment be granted. There have been other purely retail developments in the transit district for which amendments to this

requirement have been granted. This applicant should be required to conform to the ratio approved for these other retail developments.●

The Trails Coordinator made the following comments in a memorandum dated March 5, 2001:

■Staff concurs with the proposal to space the required bike racks around the existing shopping center and proposed anchor store. However, a small number of racks is also recommended at the proposed pad site. Mandatory development requirement S30 of the TDDP recommends that all new retail development shall provide 4 bicycle racks (holding a minimum of 2 bicycles each) per 10,000 gross square feet of floor space. Using this guideline, 5.3 bicycle parking spaces are required to serve the planned 6,722-square-foot restaurant. However, staff concurs that this standard is excessive. In keeping with previous recommendations, staff recommends reducing this requirement by 50 percent. Therefore, a bicycle rack(s) accommodating three bicycle parking spaces is recommended for the subject pad site.●

Comment: Urban Design staff agrees with the Trails Coordinator and recommends reducing the requirement by 50 percent for both the Outback Steakhouse and the anchor store. The plans should be revised accordingly.

S33 Afforestation of at least 10 percent of the gross tract shall be required on all properties within the Prince George's Plaza Transit District currently exempt from the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance. Afforestation shall occur on-site or within the Anacostia Watershed in Prince George's County, with priority given to riparian zones and nontidal wetlands, particularly within the Northwest Branch sub-watershed.

The applicant's representative made the following argument in a letter dated November 20, 2000:

■The applicant has previously requested an amendment to mandatory requirement S33 (see letter from Linda Ryan to Susan Lareuse dated March 3, 2000). The applicant, after making extensive efforts, has not been able to locate an appropriate mitigation site within the Anacostia watershed. The applicant wishes to fulfill requirement S33 by purchasing 5.1 acres from an approved woodland conservation bank in Prince George's County, although it may be outside of the Anacostia watershed.●

The Environmental Planning Section provided the following comment in memorandum dated September 8, 2000 (Finch to Whitmore):

■Subarea 11 is not subject to the Woodland Conservation Ordinance, since less than 10,000 square feet of trees exist; the required 10 percent afforestation, or 5.17 acres, will be provided off-site. The applicant will need to add a woodland conservation worksheet to the plan, and a TCP II number for the proposed off-site location, so it can be certified as a TCP II. This will allow the Environmental Planning Section to track and credit off-site woodland conservation proposed.

■The applicant is currently working to determine an off-site afforestation location. The location of the off-site afforestation needs to be identified prior to plan certification, and a TCP II number will be assigned to it if necessary. An approved TCP II and recorded easements for off-site mitigation will be required prior to the issuance of building permits.●

The Environmental Planning Section provided the following additional comment in memorandum dated March 20, 2001 (Finch to Whitmore):

■Discussion: Subarea 11 is not subject to the Woodland Conservation Ordinance, since less than 10,000 square feet of trees exist; the required 10 percent afforestation, or 5.17 acres, will be provided off-site.

■Required Information: The applicant shall provide a Tree Conservation Plan with a woodland conservation worksheet as part of the Detailed Site Plan. The location of the proposed off-site woodland conservation site shall be determined prior to plan certification. An approved TCP II and recorded easements for off-site mitigation will be required prior to the issuance of grading permits.●

Comment: The Urban Design staff agrees with the Environmental Planning Section and has incorporated their recommendation into this report.

S64 To avoid automobile conflicts with pedestrian circulation, curb cuts along Belcrest Road shall be limited. Pedestrian crosswalks shall be provided across all entrances in accordance with Figure 31.

The applicant's representative made the following argument in a letter dated November 20, 2000:

■The applicant will meet this requirement. However, the applicant asks that this requirement be met by providing crosswalks at the southeast corner of the property since this is the area included in the improvements.●

The Community Planning Division, in memorandum dated January 29, 2001, Fisher to Development Review Division, offered the following analysis:

■We recommend that no amendment be granted. The applicant is responsible for providing all crosswalks shown within Figure 31 within the limits of proposed development per the TDDP requirements. In addition, the pedestrian lighting along the pedestrian walkways will need to provide the required 1.25 minimum footcandles. The submitted photometric plan shows deficiencies. Therefore, we recommend that no amendment be granted.●

Comment: The Urban Design Section agrees with the Community Planning Division. However, the crosswalk across East West Highway should be part of the Phase III development and is included as Condition 5.m.

S65 All surface parking lots shall be screened from view of roadways by the use of both a low, opaque wall and an evergreen hedge (See Figure 7), unless they are providing short-term parking for ten cars or fewer.

The applicant's representative made the following argument in letter dated November 20, 2001: ■The applicant requests an amendment to allow the use of evergreen shrubs only. See justification for S8.●

The Community Planning Division, in memorandum dated January 29, 2001, Fisher to Development Review Division, offered the following analysis:

■We recommend that no amendment be granted. The rationale for this recommendation is contained under S8 and S23 above.■

Comment: The Urban Design Section agrees with the Community Planning Division. This requirement of a low, opaque wall and evergreen hedge is a unifying element throughout the Transit District. A wall along the entire street frontage where parking is located is recommended. The details and specifications of the wall should be modified to indicate brick.

5. In addition to the Secondary Requirements for which the applicant is requesting amendments, the following District Wide Secondary Mandatory Development Requirements warrant discussion:

S3 All primary and secondary walkways shall be well lighted to a minimum of 1.25 foot candles.

Comment: This information should be demonstrated prior to signature approval. In particular, the plazas must include lighting. The staff recommendation can be found in Condition 5.l.

S5 All primary and secondary pedestrian routes shall be constructed using special paving materials. (See Figure 7 for crosswalks.)

Comment: The plans should be revised to indicate this information as stated in Condition 5.m.

S11 All street trees shall be limbed up to a minimum of 6 feet above grade.

Comment: The plan should be revised to provide a note that states that shade trees within the streetscape and the plazas will be a minimum of 3.- to 4-inch caliper and limbed up to a minimum of six feet. (The minimum caliper size is contained within the figures referenced in S8.) Condition 5.p. addresses these concerns.

S12 All tree pits for street tree planting shall be designed in accordance with Figure 10, or the most current technology.

Comment: A major aspect in maintaining the quality of the environment of the pedestrian zone and the plaza areas is ensuring that the street trees are provided with an environment that they can thrive in, which is something that is typically overlooked in dense urban developments. Most of the area is existing buildings or parking. Existing conditions, along with the grading of the site, will create an extreme amount of soil compaction where trees are to grow. This compaction, along with the construction materials used for streets, parking lots and sidewalks, will severely inhibit the root growth of shade trees. Inhibiting the root growth will cause them to have stunted growth and die prematurely, never reaching their natural genetic potential, especially if they are planted in tree pits as is typically the case.

Tree pits, which are usually filled with a soil mixture, often become ■bath tubs■ because the soil around them is compacted to a point that water entering the pit cannot infiltrate into the soil below and around the pit. Trees planted in pits thus suffer from inadequate drainage and aeration, and their growth is stunted as a result. Furthermore, typical tree pits rarely provide adequate soil volumes. A tree pit that measures 5 feet by 12 feet with a soil depth of three feet will provide 180 cubic feet of soil volume. The average shade tree, with a crown spread/diameter of 20 feet. needs a minimum soil volume of 628 cubic feet to thrive. The rule of thumb is two cubic feet of soil volume for every one square foot of crown projection. Insufficient soil volume prevents most trees in pits from ever attaining more than a fraction of their normal size. One area where needed soil volumes can be attained is under the sidewalk. Taking advantage of a continuous soil volume under the sidewalk which connects tree pits, tree roots can expand freely, there are more water and nutrients available, and trees are much more capable of growing to their full potential.

As recommended in the American Institute of Architects■recently revised *Architectural Graphic Standards*, staff recommends that in addition to the requirements of the TDDP, the Detailed Site Plan provide details that ensure that tree pits within the plaza areas, including the linear plaza, be connected with a continuous soil volume under the sidewalk, with an average 500 cubic feet of soil volume per tree and a maximum soil depth of 24 inches. This will help ensure the health and long life of the trees in this area and allow them to attain

sufficient size to provide real shade for pedestrians. Large healthy trees will also significantly bolster the plaza and pedestrian experience. Failure to provide adequate soil volume for shade trees at the beginning of this project will result in an endless struggle with stunted or dying trees that never reach their full potential.

Staff has recently learned of a new product developed and patented by Cornell University called ■CU-Soil• (Cornell University Soil) which is a ■Structural Soil• that is a mixture of stone, soil, and a wetting agent that is specifically designed for trees planted in paved conditions, such as streets, sidewalks and parking lots. The soil is made of 80 percent stone, which provides the structural support for pavement, and 20 percent soil. ■CU-Soil• can be compacted to meet ASTM and AASHTO standards, providing the structural support necessary for paved surfaces, while allowing unimpeded root growth of trees under pavement, ensuring that the trees reach their full potential. Locally, the product has been approved by the Montgomery County DPW&T for the Downtown Silver Spring revitalization project, and the Prince George's County Planning Board for the Bowie New Town Center Mall. It has also been used for several projects in downtown Washington, D.C. There are two licensed distributors in the area (one is located in Springfield, Virginia, and the other is in Landover, Maryland) that can design, test and mix the appropriate materials to exact specifications. Staff recommends that ■CU-Soil• or an equal product be used for all shade trees planted in tree pits within the development.

S13 All major pedestrian crossings, such as crossings that traverse more than three lanes of traffic, shall have a contrasting pavement material. Crossings are to conform to all Road Code standards and conform with Figure 7.

Comment: In accordance with the above requirement, a crosswalk should be provided across the travel lanes of the main entrance road off of East West Highway and across East West Highway, as will be required in Phase 3 of the development. Prior to signature approval the plans should be revised to indicate this.

S15 All plazas shall have paving materials that are high quality, visually attractive and compatible with adjacent building elements. A combination of the following may be required: brick, concrete pavers, flagstone, tile, exposed aggregate concrete, granite setts, cobbles. Large expanses of poured concrete are not acceptable. A detailed paving/banding plan will be required at the time of Detailed Site Plan.

Comment: The details and specifications of the plaza area design should be revised and approved by the Urban Design Section prior to signature approval.

S16 A performance bond, letter of credit or other suitable financial guarantee shall be required for the plaza area and any plaza amenities.

Comment: Staff recommends in Condition 7 that the above be provided prior to the issuance of a building permit for the Outback Steakhouse (Phase I).

S18 All parking lots shall not extend beyond the build-to-line or project beyond the front plane of adjoining buildings.

Comment: A build-to-line is not required along East West Highway. The applicant has asked for a waiver of the build-to line along Belcrest Road. If the amendment to the build-to line is granted (see TP-00001), then this requirement would not apply.

S19 All large-surface parking lots (lots with more than 100 spaces) shall be segmented into smaller units, using methods of continuous internal green in conformance with the *Landscape Manual*, Section 4.3(c)(5).

Comment: This requirement has not been demonstrated in Phase I of the development. This must be conformed to or the plans amended as stated in Condition 5.q.

S24 All lighting poles, fixture designs, light retention and level of illumination shall be coordinated throughout the transit district to achieve a recognizable design, and be consistent with the streetscape construction drawings provided in Appendix A.

Comment: The light fixtures and poles selected by the applicant are consistent with the streetscape construction drawings provided in Appendix A.

S25 All lighting shall have a minimum level of 1.25 footcandles, and shall be provided for all outdoor spaces, plazas, parking lots, etc., for the safety and welfare of all users.

Comment: A photometric plan indicates that Phase II complies with the above; however, a photometric plan must indicate that Phases I and III also comply. This should be fulfilled prior to signature approval as stated in Condition 5.r.

S28 All commercial or industrial establishments shall provide a common sign plan when there is more than one principal building proposed (not including accessory buildings), such as shopping centers, malls and office parks on a single lot or combination of lots under common ownership. Common sign plans shall specify standards for consistency among all signs within the development including lighting, colors, lettering style and size and relative location of each sign on the building. New signs proposed in connection with exterior renovation or rehabilitation of 60 percent or more of an existing structure shall also submit a common sign plan. No sign permit shall be issued for a sign requiring a permit unless a common sign plan for the development on which the sign will be erected has been submitted and approved by the Planning Director or designee.

Comment: The applicant has submitted a signage plan, but additional details and specifications are needed to find conformance to the approved signage plan for the shopping center as stated in Condition 8.

S31 At the time of Detailed Site Plan, the number of trash cans and locations shall be shown on the plan. Trash receptacles should be placed in strategic locations to prevent litter from accumulating in and around the proposed development.

Comment: This requirement has been fulfilled.

S32 Prior to final inspection and sign-off of permits by the Sediment/Stormwater or Building Inspector, any storm drain inlets associated with the development and all inlets on the subject subarea shall be stenciled with ■Do Not Dump. Chesapeake Bay Drainage. The Detailed Site Plan and the Sediment Control Plan (in the sequence of construction) shall contain this information.

Comment: Prior to signature approval the site plan should be revised to contain this information as stated in Condition 5.u.

6. The following Subarea 11 Secondary Mandatory Development Requirements are contained within the TDDP and warrant discussion:

S63 A public parking structure shall be located on the north side of the shopping center for possible shared use by the existing shopping center, its additional development and the adjacent subareas.

Comment: The plans indicate conceptually where a future parking structure will be located.

S66 Loading areas shall be recessed and/or completely screened from public view. If a screen wall is required at the time of Detailed Site Plan review, it shall be an extension of the building.

Comment: The Outback Steakhouse incorporates a previously constructed loading area with a three- to four-foot wall around the loading space. This wall is insufficient to screen the loading area from the users of the shopping center. This is a problem because of the prominent location of the pad site at the front of the center. Staff recommends a six-foot-high brick screen wall similar in design to the water table feature on the main building, as stated in Condition 8.d.

S67 The proposed architecture shall be enduring, high quality and distinctive.

Comment: The proposed architecture for the Outback Steakhouse incorporates features of the existing structure in the design of the architecture. The staff has recommended minor

changes to the architectural elevations for the purpose of unifying the structure visually as viewed from all sides of the building. The structure is located at the front of the shopping center, along East West Highway. In order to upgrade the appearance from all sides, since all sides of the structure are highly visible, whether by the passerby in the vehicle or from within the parking lot of the shopping center, it is important from a design standpoint to treat each side with the same amount of architectural detailing. For example, the architecture indicates a neon strip at the bottom of the roofline that does not wrap around the entire building. This is a highly visible element at night and the building will look unfinished without this neon element completely encircling the structure. This and other architectural detailing changes are included in Condition 8.

7. Section 27-548.08(c), Required Findings for a Detailed Site Plan in the Transit District Overlay Zone (TDOZ).

(B) The Transit District Site Plan is consistent with, and reflects the guidelines and criteria contained in the Transit District Development Plan;

The Transit District Site Plan will be consistent with, and reflect the guidelines and criteria contained in, the Transit District Development Plan when the conditions of approval below are met.

(C) The Transit District Site Plan meets all of the requirements of the Transit District Overlay Zone and applicable regulations of the underlying zones;

Comment: The development data as follows demonstrates conformance to the C-S-C zone:

Zone	T-D-O-Z (C-S-C)
Total Site Area	51.78 acres
Existing Gross Floor Area	959,500 sf.
Proposed Gross Floor Area	1,047,342 sf.
Floor Areas Ratio	0.46
Number of Existing Parking Spaces (surface)	3,583 spaces
Number of Proposed Parking Spaces (surface)	3,117 spaces
Number of Structured Spaces	0
Loading Spaces Required:	10 spaces
Loading Spaces Provided:	7 spaces at grade 20 spaces in underground tunnel

- (D) The location, size and design of buildings, signs, other structures, open spaces, landscaping, pedestrian and vehicular circulation systems, and parking and loading areas maximize safety and efficiency and are adequate to meet the purposes of the Transit District Overlay Zone;**

The subject application includes an existing development that is only being partially redeveloped. In the areas of the plan that indicate redevelopment, the layout of the development minimizes conflicts between pedestrian and vehicular circulation systems. Also, a portion of the development indicated as Phase II is for Infrastructure only. Architecture for the future anchor store is not included in the review. The portion of the development shown as Phase I includes the development around the Outback Steakhouse. This architectural proposal provides for coordinated architectural building style and materials if the conditions of approval are adopted. The plan also provides adequate open space areas for landscaping in and around the linear pedestrian walkways, provides for safe and efficient parking and loading areas, and is adequate to meet the purposes of the TDOZ, if the conditions of approval are adopted .

- (E) Each structure and use, in the manner proposed, is compatible with other structures in the Transit District and with existing and proposed adjacent development.**

The proposed building for the Outback Steakhouse will be architecturally coordinated in terms of building materials and style and will be situated on the site in a manner which is compatible with the surrounding existing and proposed development if the conditions of approval regarding the modification to the architecture are adopted. The conditions of approval improve the proposed architecture so that when viewed from any direction, the structure is equally detailed in a manner to reflect a unified and consistent design (also see discussion under S67, above).

8. Section 27-213.06(c)(3)(B), Required Findings for Secondary Amendment of Transit District Development Plan:

- (i) The requested Secondary Amendment is in compliance with the requirements for the approved Transit District Development Plan as set forth in Section 27-548.08 (c).**

The Secondary Amendments to S8, S17, S30 and S33 are in compliance with the requirement of the TDDP in that the Detailed Site Plan meets all of the applicable regulations of the underlying zone; the building, parking, loading and pedestrian facilities are designed to maximize safety and efficiency; and each structure and use, in the manner proposed, is compatible with other structures and uses in the Transit District, and with the existing and proposed adjacent development, if the conditions of approval are adopted. The requested Secondary Amendments to S23, S64 and S65 do not meet the above criteria and the staff recommends denial.

(ii) The requested Secondary Amendment is in conformance with the purposes of the Transit District Overlay Zone.

The Secondary Amendments to S8, S17, S30 and S33 are in conformance with the applicable purposes of the TDOZ. Specifically, the amendments to S8 for improvements along the property frontage, S17 for parking occupying more than 33 percent the property frontage, S30 for the number of bicycles required, and S33 for Woodland Conservation are necessary to accomplish an efficient design for the proposed development and will therefore provide the necessary flexibility in the design and layout of the buildings and structures to promote a coordinated and integrated development scheme.

(iii) The original intent of the Transit District Development Plan element or mandatory requirement being amended is still fulfilled with the approval of the Secondary Amendment.

Given the nature of the retail use, the existing site conditions and associated parking, loading and vehicular and pedestrian circulation, the requested amendments are justified and fulfill the original intent of the Transit District Development Plan.

9. In memorandum dated March 13, 2001, the Transportation Planning Section provided the following analysis:

■The approved Prince George's Plaza Transit District Development Plan (TDDP) guides the use and development of all properties within its boundaries. The findings and recommendations outlined below are based upon staff evaluation of the submitted site plan and each of the requested amendments and the ways in which the proposed development conforms to the Mandatory Development Requirements and Guideline outlined in the TDDP.

■During the preparation of the TDDP, staff performed an analysis of all road facilities in the vicinity of the TDOZ. This analysis was based on establishment of a transit district-wide cap on the number of additional parking spaces (preferred and premium) that can be constructed or provided in the transit district to accommodate any new development. Pursuant to this concept, the plan recommends implementing a system of developer contributions to ensure adequacy of the transportation facilities, based on the number of additional surface parking spaces, as long as the authorized total surface parking limits and their attendant, respective, parking ratios (Tables 5 and 6 of the TDDP) are not exceeded. The collected fee will be applied toward the required number of transportation improvements totaling \$1,562,000, as summarized in Table 4 of the TDDP. These improvements are needed to ensure that the critical roadways and intersections in the transit district will remain adequate and will be operating at or above Level-of-Service E, as required by the plan.

■ The total number of proposed surface parking spaces shown in the submitted Detailed Site Plan is less than the total number of surface parking spaces that were existing on this subarea prior to the approval of the TDDP. Pursuant to the TDDP applicability, replacement or alterations to legally preexisting parking spaces are exempt from meeting the TDDP Transportation and Parking Mandatory Requirements. Since the accumulated sum of all approved additional surface parking spaces in the transit district does not exceed the recommended parking cap, the review of the submitted Detailed Site Plan will be limited to the adequacy determination of the site access points, vehicular and pedestrian circulation, and the level of compliance with all other applicable transportation-related requirements and design guidelines.

■ . . The submitted site plan indicates a total of 3,118 surface parking spaces, which is 465 spaces less than the 3,583 surface parking spaces that were existing on this site prior to the approval of the TDDP. Pursuant to the requirements of the TDDP, the proposed 3,118 surface spaces are considered to be replacements of the legally existing surface parking spaces on this subarea and exempt from the TDDP parking requirements. Therefore, the proposed application, if approved as submitted, will not change the total available preferred and premium surface parking totals for retail uses or for the Transit District.

■ It is important to note that in the submitted Detailed Site Plan the total number of surface parking spaces is reduced from 3,583, which are exempt from the TDDP requirements, to 3,118 spaces.

■ On-site vehicular circulation patterns as proposed are acceptable. However, the site plan does not provide for a safe pedestrian walkway across the right-in driveway west of the Belcrest Road and next to the proposed pedestrian bridge. In addition, the submitted Detailed Site Plan does not provide for an 11-foot-wide sidewalk along the site's entire frontage with MD 410, as recommended by the TDDP.

■ The center is currently being serviced by the Washington Area Metropolitan Transit Authority (WMATA) and The University of Maryland shuttle buses at a bus stop within the center's parking area. The submitted Detailed Site Plan is proposing to eliminate this on-site bus stop. At a meeting held on March 5, 2001, with the representatives of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) and the Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation, it was determined that the proposed bus stop along East West Highway could create unacceptable and unsafe travel conditions. Furthermore, and to further improve transit accessibility to and from the transit district, the WMATA and county officials agreed to reorient the current bus routes from the plaza to the Prince George's Plaza Metro Station.

■It should be noted that the 1998 PG-TDDP also authorized the Prince George's Plaza Transportation Demand Management District (TDMD), which requires that each property owner in the district to be a member and participate in the TDMD. The annual TDMD membership fee is \$5.00 for each surface parking space. The annual TDMD membership fee for parking spaces in structures and surface spaces that are permanently reserved for handicapped occupant vehicles, carpools and vanpools are set at a rate of \$2.00 per space. As is required by the TDDP, the Transportation Planning Section will begin the implementation of the TDMD and its requirements as outlined in the county Zoning Ordinance, once the total allocation under the approved preferred parking cap has been reached.

■Transportation Staff Conclusions

■Based on the preceding findings, the Transportation Planning Section concludes that the proposed Detailed Site Plan as submitted will be in conformance and consistent with all applicable Transit District Mandatory Transportation and Parking Requirements and Site Design Guidelines, and the proposed development will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with existing, programmed or planned transportation facilities, if the following conditions are included as a part of approval of the subject submitted Detailed Site Plan:

- a. Prior to the signature approval of the Detailed Site Plan, plans shall be revised to show a raised pedestrian zone of at least 11 feet wide across the right-in driveway from East West Highway.●
- b. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, a continuous 11-foot-wide multipurpose pedestrian walkway shall be constructed along the entire portion of the property that fronts on East West Highway per the TDDP requirements, and Prince George's County DPW&T and Maryland State Highway Administration Standards.●
- c. Prior to the signature approval of the Detailed Site Plan, plans shall be revised to show only one bus pull-off area accommodating three or more buses along Belcrest Road, per the WMATA and DPW&T standards.●

Comment: These conditions have been included in the Recommendation section of this report. Condition b above is modified in a Phasing Plan as stated in Condition 2, 3 and 4 of the Recommendation Section of this report.

10. The plans have been reviewed for conformance to the *Landscape Manual* and there are some outstanding issues. First, conformance to Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, was the subject of an Alternative Compliance application that was denied. The applicant has subsequently submitted a Departure from Design Standards (DDS-515) application that is

being reviewed concurrently with this application. Second, Sections 4.3(a) and (c), Parking Lot Requirements, and 4.4, Screening Requirements apply to this site. The plans do not demonstrate conformance to Section 4.3(a), Landscape Strip Requirements, for the entire East West Highway and they do not demonstrate conformance to Section 4.3(c) Internal Green Requirements.

Mandatory Requirement S19 states the following:

- **All large-surface parking lots (lots with more than 100 spaces) shall be segmented into smaller units, using methods of continuous internal green in conformance with the Landscape Manual, Section 4.3(c)(5).**

The mandatory requirement above overrides any general exemptions from the *Landscape Manual*. If this property were not subject to the above mandatory requirement, the post-1970, pre-manual site exemption would apply. However, because the property is in the TDOZ and the TDOZ specifically recognizes Section 4.3(c) of the *Landscape Manual*, it is only reasonable to assume it applies. The staff recommends that the plans be amended to demonstrate conformance to Section 4.3(a) and (c) as stated above and amend the plans as necessary.

Section 4.4, Screening Requirements, also applies to the property. The loading space associated with the anchor store will need to be screened from Belcrest Road. This issue will be revisited when the applicant submits the Detailed Site Plan for the architecture. The architecture must be reviewed by the Planning Board prior to the issuance of a building permit.

11. The Mayor and Common Council of University Park reviewed the application and provided the following preliminary comments in a letter dated June 5, 2000, to Liz Whitmore:

- We would expect that any development provide for water quality and quantity control in accordance with all federal, state and county regulations. (TDDP P25 Mandatory Development Requirements)
- We would expect that where stormwater management cannot be provided for on the existing developed property, a mandatory 15 percent green space requirement shall be provided with the possibility of the green space being incorporated into the mandatory 10 percent afforestation requirement (referred to in S33, Woodland Conservation) if it occurs on the actual property. (TDDP P26 Mandatory Development Requirements)
- We have no objection to waivers of the build-to lines of 20 feet from face of curb along Belcrest Road or a build-to line of 40 feet from face of curb along Belcrest Road with intervening streetscaping.

- We strongly support a pedestrian walkway and streetscape along the entire frontage of the Plaza along East West Highway without any phasing. This streetscape may be reduced in width by providing tree wells/trees on both sides of a sidewalk. Convenient and efficient pedestrian access is a crucial element for the success of the Plaza and the concept of Metro, as well as being one of the primary purposes of a TDOZ. Phasing is not acceptable because it suggests no dates definite for completion of pedestrian access and does not fulfill the mandate for a coordinated and integrated development scheme.
- Providing bike racks throughout the entire center is preferable, rather than clustered near the proposed anchor store.
- Mandated trash containers should, likewise, be placed throughout the entire center.
- The loading areas should be recessed and/or completely screened from public view and as an extension of the building. (TDDP S66 Subarea 11 Mandatory Development Requirements)
- Elimination of internal bus circulation should be justified by applicant.
- Required plaza areas on Belcrest Road and on East West Highway at the base of the Metro pedestrian overpass should be clearly separated from the proposed bus stops. Bus stops are places for congregation while the plazas are for pedestrian use, respite, aesthetic enhancement and seating. (TDDP P98 Subarea 11 Mandatory Development Requirements)
- The plaza seating requirements for the Belcrest Road, bank, and Metro overpass areas appear reasonable. Sixty-six linear feet for the overpass, 50 for the bank, and 80 for Belcrest Road are appropriate considering the scope of the area under consideration, as opposed to 18, 0, and 24, respectively. (TDDP G28 Site Design Guidelines) The guidelines include such options as planters, seat walls, and grassy seating. •

In another letter dated March 23, 2001, the Town of University Park provided the following comments and recommendations:

■ **S8, S23, & S65** The applicant requests as secondary amendments the deletion of a required opaque screening wall which would enhance the visual continuity and unity of the streetscape.

■ **We oppose the deletion of the required screening wall.** The applicant contends that this requirement is too costly, but screening has been deemed essential in the adopted TDDP, and the wall would integrate the streetscape with existing opaque walls constructed in sub-area 4 (Blockbuster) and in sub-area 9 (Home Depot).

■The applicant may wish to alternate short sections of ornamental fencing to add additional interest, such as what the applicant identified near the Metro bridge.

■**S64** The applicant proposes to amend the crosswalk configuration as shown in Figure 31.

■**We oppose any amendment to the crosswalk requirements.** The applicant is required to provide all crosswalks as shown in the TDDP and should adhere to this requirement where ever proposed development is to occur. The applicant offers no justification for any change.

■We would like to offer two general comments regarding the issue of phasing the installation of the streetscaping/lighting.

■**1. We suggest that the DSP encompass the entire frontage of the Prince Georges Plaza.**

■This requirement will help guarantee a uniform streetscape/landscape treatment along East-West Highway and Belcrest Road. (Currently, the applicant has submitted plans for only the anchor store area and the restaurant area.)

■**2. We also strongly suggest that if phasing occurs that the restaurant streetscape/landscape area encompass the entire linear frontage along East-West Highway to Belcrest Road. (A bank is currently located at the corner of East-West HIGHWAY and Belcrest Road.)**

■**We also suggest that dates definite be established for the completion of the streetscape/landscaping along East-West Highway and Belcrest road in the event phasing occurs.**

12. The City of Hyattsville reviewed the application and provided the following comments in a letter dated January 18, 2001, to Ms. Whitmore:

■Secondary Amendments

■**S8, S17, S23**

■We concur with the applicant for the reasons stated.

■**S30** We disagree with the applicant and wish to sustain the number of bicycle racks required by TDOZ. We would allow consideration of the applicant's request to place some of the racks adjacent to mall entrances.

■S33 *Afforestation of at least 10 percent of the gross tract shall be required on all properties within the Prince George's Plaza Transit District currently exempt from Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance. Afforestation shall occur on-site or within the Anacostia Watershed in Prince George's County, with priority given to riparian zones and non-tidal wetlands, particularly within the Northwest Branch sub-watershed.▲

■The applicant wishes to fulfill this requirement by purchasing 5.1 ●acres from an approved woodland conservation bank in Prince George's County. The City of Hyattsville has adopted a strong tree preservation ordinance and established a working Shade Tree Board that is concerned with the maintenance and preservation of our urban forest on both public and private lands. The City of Hyattsville is a designated Tree City U.S.A. issued by the National Arbor Day Foundation. We would like to have the opportunity to identify suitable reforestation or afforestation property within the Anacostia Watershed. We request the applicant's petition for meeting this provision of the TDO by purchase of acreage from a woodland conservation bank be denied.●

13. The proposed Detailed Site Plan represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines, without requiring unreasonable costs 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 Secondary Amendment TS-99044A and Detailed Site Plan SP-99044 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to signature approval of the Detailed Site Plan, any changes to the plans required by the Primary Amendment TP-00001 shall be fulfilled.
2. As part of the review of a Detailed Site Plan for the proposed anchor store or a new pad site, a determination shall be made as to the timing of the construction of Phase III streetscape improvements.
3. Phase I streetscape improvements are along East West Highway from the existing ATM of the Chevey Chase Bank to the main entrance, as indicated on Staff Exhibit A and shall also include a temporary brick paver sidewalk on the west side of the right-in-only driveway. All site improvements within Phase I shall be completed before the certificate of occupancy for the Outback Steakhouse is issued by the Department of Environmental Resources.
4. Construction of all site improvements for Phase II as shown on Staff Exhibit A shall be completed prior to issuance of the certificate of occupancy for the anchor store by DER.
5. Prior to certificate of approval the plans shall be revised to indicate the following:

- a. The sidewalk located in the streetscape along East West Highway shall be a minimum of 8 feet wide.
- b. The streetscape/pedestrian zone shall be shown along the entire frontage of East West Highway. The design of the streetscape and associated plazas shall consider all of the issues discussed in the finding discussing S8 under the comments of the Urban Design Section. These plans shall be referred to the Town of University Park and the City of Hyattsville for review and comment.
- c. A three-foot-high brick wall shall be provided along the parking compound along the entire length of the East West Highway frontage with final design details to be agreed upon by the staff and applicant.
- d. A sidewalk and crosswalk shall be provided from the main entrance at East West Highway to the shopping center on the west side of the Outback Steakhouse as shown in Figure 31 of the text.
- e. The plans shall be revised to provide an irrigation system to maintain the plant material in the plaza area adjacent to the pedestrian bridge and along the linear plaza.
- f. The details and specifications of the bus shelters on Belcrest Road shall be reviewed and approved by the Transportation Planning Section and the Urban Design Section.
- g. Plans shall be revised to show a raised pedestrian crossing, a minimum of 8 feet wide, across the right-in-only driveway from East West Highway.
- h. Plans shall be revised to show only one bus pull-off area accommodating three or more buses along Belcrest Road, per the WMATA and DPW&T standards. The bus pull-off area along East West Highway shall be eliminated.
- i. Lighting fixtures shall be clearly delineated on the plans and shall be placed approximately 60 feet on center along East West Highway and 45 feet on center along the linear plaza.
- j. The crosswalk across East West Highway as shown in Figure 31 shall be shown on the plans upon approval from the State Highway Administration (SHA). If approved by the State Highway Administration, this crosswalk shall be implemented in Phase III of the development.
- k. The plans shall be revised to conform to Section 4.3(a) and (c) of the *Landscape Manual* for Phases I and II.

- l. The Detailed Site Plan shall specify that all tree pits within the plazas shall be connected with a continuous noncompacted soil volume under the sidewalk. Details of how this will be accomplished shall be included on the plans and shall be agreed upon by the Planning Board or its designee. The use of ■CU-Soil• as a ■structural soil• or other equal product for shade trees planted in tree pits is required.
- m. A photometric plan shall be submitted for Phases I and III to demonstrate that the plazas and parking areas and areas around the building are a minimum of 1.25 footcandles.
- n. The plan shall indicate bicycle parking at 50 percent of the required rate of S30 and the plans shall be modified to indicate the location of the spaces and the details and specifications.
- o. Appropriate details and the following note shall be added to the Detailed Site Plan and the Sediment Control Plan:

■Prior to the final inspection and sign-off of permits by the Sediment/Stormwater or Building Inspector, any storm drain inlets associated with the development and all inlets on the subject subarea shall be stenciled with •Do Not Dump, Chesapeake Bay Drainage.▲
- p. A Woodland Conservation Worksheet shall be added to the plans, and the plan shall be certified as a TCPH/100/00. The following note shall be added under the worksheet:

■S33 of the Prince George▲s Plaza TDDP requires the afforestation of at least 10 percent of the gross tract for all properties within the Prince George▲s Plaza Transit District currently exempt from the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance. Afforestation shall occur on-site or within the Anacostia Watershed in Prince George▲s County to the extent possible, with priority given to riparian zones and nontidal wetlands, particularly within the Northwest Branch sub-watershed.●
- q. The location of the off-site woodland conservation mitigation for TCPH/100/00 shall be identified. If the proposed location is outside the Anacostia watershed, documentation shall be provided to the Environmental Planning Section which indicates that off-site woodland conservation sites have been diligently pursued on private property in the Anacostia watershed for a minimum of three sites.
- r. The applicant shall submit a Phase II Noise Study for the construction proposed on ■Phase 1,• as shown on the Detailed Site Plan. The Noise Study shall be reviewed and approved by the Environmental Planning Section (as the successor to the Natural Resources Division) prior to certification of the Detailed Site Plan. The

recommendations contained in the Phase II Noise Study shall be shown on the Detailed Site Plan and architectural drawings prior to certification.

6. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, an approved TCP II and recorded easements for off-site mitigation shall be obtained.
7. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for Phase I, a performance bond, letter of credit or other suitable financial guarantee shall be submitted to the Development Review Division of M-NCPPC for the plaza area.
8. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for Phase II, a performance bond, letter of credit or other suitable financial guarantee shall be submitted to the Development Review Division of M-NCPPC for the plaza area.
9. Prior to the issuance of any building permits for Phase II, architectural elevations shall be approved by the Planning Board.
10. Prior to signature approval of the architecture for the Outback Steakhouse, the following modifications shall be made:
 - a. The proposed cornice and dentil molding shall be continued around the entire north and west facades. The proposed neon lighting shall wrap around the entire building.
 - b. The color of the shingles shall be revised from green to indicate either a black or gray color or combination of the black or gray if the existing slate roof is not preserved.
 - c. The site plan and architectural drawings shall be revised to indicate a six-foot-high screen wall around the dumpster enclosure, with a water table in design and color to the water table feature on the main building. The watertable on the dumpster enclosure will transition to the existing retaining wall, which will be refaced to match the watertable.
 - d. All utility doors shall be of a color to blend with the color of the siding.
 - e. The signage information shall be provided to demonstrate conformance to the overall sign plan and shall include color and size specifications.

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 Lowe, seconded by Commissioner Brown, with Commissioners Lowe, Brown and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion and with Commissioner Eley absent at its regular meeting held on Thursday, April 12, 2001, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 10th day of May 2001.

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:SL:rmk