

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board is charged with the approval of Detailed Site Plans pursuant to Part 3, Division 9 of the Zoning Ordinance of the Prince George's County Code; and

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on March 16, 2000, regarding Detailed Site Plan SP-99051 for Walker Mill Business Park, the Planning Board finds:

1. The subject site (Lot 5A), consisting of approximately 0.71 acres, is located on the south side of Prosperity Court, a cul-de-sac street in the Walker Mill Business Park. The adjacent properties to the east and west are vacant and the property to the southwest has a contractor's yard and the property to the southeast is vacant.
2. The proposed use is a contractor's storage yard for Santos Concrete. The applicant is proposing a six-foot-high board-on-board fence along all the property lines. A 30-foot-wide driveway is proposed for the subject site with an entrance gate.
3. A Preliminary Subdivision Plat 4-87194 was approved on January 7, 1988 (PGCPB No. 88-06) for 43 lots and one parcel on a 74.4-acre parcel of land known as Walker Mill Business Park. Condition #3 of Preliminary Plat 4-87194 reads as follows:

**Detailed Site Plans for individual lots shall be approved by the Planning Board prior to building permits. These site plan reviews shall address, but not be limited to, the items listed in the Area Planning Division's memorandum dated September 16, 1987.**

The memorandum dated September 16, 1987, lists the following design criteria that are applicable to the subject property:

1. All projects within this subject property shall be subject to site plan review by the Prince George's County Planning Board. The site plan shall contain a landscaping plan.
2. The Planning Board shall review the development to assure its compliance with the following design guidelines:
  - a. An effective visual buffer created by substantial berms and landscaping shall be provided along Walker Mill Road, Rollins Avenue and Addison Road and along abutting areas which are planned or developed for residential purposes in order to maintain the residential character of surrounding properties.

- b. The internal organization of the site shall address the following:
- (1) Minimizing the views of parking, loading, storage and service areas.
  - (2) Providing architectural elevations consistent in materials and treatment on all sides, and with all mechanical equipment enclosed or screened. Screening and enclosures shall be treated as integral elements of building design.
  - (3) Signs shall not be placed above the roof or parapet line. No moving or flashing signs, or signs projecting significantly from a building, shall be permitted. Low ground-mounted and landscaped signs in keeping with the scale of the buildings and the site shall be encouraged in lieu of building-mounted signs.

Since there are no buildings on the site, the above design criteria for buildings do not apply to this site. Staff has added a condition of approval to require a landscape buffer along Prosperity Court to ensure minimizing views of parking, loading, storage and service areas.

3. Section 27-469, I-1 Zone (Light Industrial), of the Zoning Ordinance establishes the following parameters for landscaping, screening and buffering of development in the I-1 Zone:

- (1) *At least ten percent (10%) of the net lot area shall be maintained as green area.*

The applicant has provided 10 percent green area (3,100 square feet).

- (2) *Any landscaped strip adjacent to a public right-of-way required pursuant to the provisions of the Landscape Manual shall not be considered part of the required green area.*

No landscaping is proposed along the public right-of-way that can be considered a part of the required green area.

4. The proposed use, contractor's storage yard, is a permitted use in the I-1 Zone. At present, the applicant will be using it to park trucks used in the contracting operations. The site will be used as a contractor's storage yard in the near future. A condition of approval has been added to ensure that the proposed green area, the area demarcated for the truck parking and the area demarcated for the storage of materials be shown on the drawings. A condition of approval has also been added to require a Detailed Site Plan application for all future buildings on site. With these

conditions, the proposal will be consistent with the design criteria listed in the above findings. There are no parking requirements for a contractor's storage yard.

5. The proposal is subject to the requirements of Section 4.7 (Buffering Incompatible Uses) of the *Landscape Manual*. The proposed use is considered a high impact use. One of the adjacent properties has a contractor's yard and the rest of the adjacent properties are vacant. The contractor's storage yard is considered a high impact use and the adjacent vacant lots are also considered to be high impact uses. Since the adjacent uses are compatible uses, no landscape buffers are required along these property lines.

According to the applicability section of the *Landscape Manual*, new uses on sites with existing buildings and addition of square footage of more than 10% of the existing building are subject to the requirements of Section 4.2 (Commercial and Industrial Landscape Strip Requirements) of the *Landscape Manual*. The applicability section does not specifically address new uses on sites with no buildings. Staff recommends that the Planning Board find that the requirements of Section 4.2 of the *Landscape Manual* also apply to properties like the subject site that have new uses but no buildings. If that is the case, this proposal is subject to the requirements of Section 4.2 of the *Landscape Manual*. A ten-foot-wide landscape strip planted with four shade trees and 40 shrubs is required along Prosperity Court to meet the requirements of the *Landscape Manual*. The proposed board-on-board fence along Prosperity Court must be set back 10 feet to accommodate the landscape strip. A condition of approval has been added to require the fence to be set back to accommodate the landscape strip with the required planting.

6. The Permits Review Section (Shields to Srinivas, February 7, 2000) has stated that the proposal must meet the requirements of previous conditions of approval, the Zoning Ordinance and the *Landscape Manual*. The proposal meets these requirements.
7. The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (Maholtz to Srinivas, January 20, 2000) has stated that there are no impacts due to the proposal.
8. The Community Planning Division (Osei to Srinivas, February 17, 2000) has stated that the proposal must meet the design criteria listed in the *1985 Approved Master Plan for Suitland-District Heights and Vicinity* for Walker Mill Business Park property. The Division has also stated that the Master Plan requires that the trucks with weight limits that would require three or more axles be restricted from using Walker Mill Road for through trips from Ritchie Road to Addison Road. This would apply to all traffic generated by the industrial park using Walker Mill Road for ingress and egress. The proposal meets the design criteria listed in the Master Plan. The restriction on trucks with weight limits does not apply to the subject site.

9. The Transportation Planning Division (Masog to Srinivas, March 2, 2000) has no comments regarding this proposal.
10. The Environmental Planning Section (Metzger to Srinivas, January 21, 2000) has stated that the proposal is exempt from the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance. The applicant has submitted a letter of exemption from the Woodland Conservation Ordinance dated November 18, 1999. There are no other environmental impacts associated with this proposal.
11. The Department of Environmental Resources (Guzman to Srinivas, January 27, 2000) has stated that the proposal is in compliance with the stormwater management concept approval #008002670.
12. The Subdivision Section (Chellis to Srinivas, February 4, 2000) has stated that the proposal must be consistent with the conditions of approval for Preliminary Plat 4-87194. The proposal is consistent with the conditions of approval. A condition of approval has been added to require revision of the site plan to show the correct final plat number NLP 141 @11.
13. The Department of Public Works and Transportation (Kassiri to Srinivas, February 10, 2000) has stated that all improvements within the public right-of-way must be in accordance with the DPW&T specifications and the Americans with Disabilities Act.
14. The Town of Capitol Heights was sent a referral. As of the date of the staff report, the Town had not sent any comments.
15. With the proposed conditions, the Detailed Site Plan SP-99051 is found to represent 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 Detailed Site Plan for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certification of the Detailed Site Plan, the site/landscape plans shall be revised to show:
  - a. The green area, the area for parking of the trucks and the area for storage of contractor's materials.

- b. The proposed board-on-board fence along Prosperity Court set back 10 feet to accommodate the landscape strip.
  - c. A 10-foot-wide landscape strip planted with four shade trees and 40 shrubs along Prosperity Court to meet the requirements of the *Landscape Manual*.
  - d. The correct final plat number, NLP 141 @ 11.
2. A Detailed Site Plan application shall be filed for all future buildings on site.

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 adoption of this Resolution.

\* \* \* \* \*

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 Brown, seconded by Commissioner McNeill, with Commissioners Brown, McNeill, Boone and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, March 16, 2000, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 6th day of April 2000.

Trudye Morgan Johnson  
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin  
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:LAX:aj