

C O R R E C T E D R E S O L U T I O N

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

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on November 9, 2006 regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-05014/01 for Largo Park, Lot 5B, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The subject application is for approval of a detailed site plan for a six-story office building in the I-3 Zone.
2. **Development Data Summary**

	Existing	Proposed
Zone(s)	I-3	I-3
Use(s)	N/A	Office
Acreage	9.14	9.14
Lots	1	1
Parcels	1	1
Square Footage/GFA	N/A	144,000 square feet

Other Development Data

	Required	Provided
Total parking spaces	363	461
Of which standard spaces	242	269
Handicapped spaces	8	9
Loading Space	2	2

3. **Location:** The site is in Planning Area 73, Council District 6. More specifically, it is located in the southwest quadrant of the intersection of Landover Road (MD 202) and Lottsford Road.
4. **Surroundings and Use:** The subject property is bounded to the northwest by Lottsford Road; to the southwest by existing office use; to the northeast by Landover Road (MD 202); and to the southeast, by vacant I-3-zoned land.
5. **Previous Approvals:** The subject site has a previously approved Conceptual Site Plan, CSP-87168/01, Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-98064, Infrastructure DSP-05014, and Stormwater Management Concept Plan 8000070-1992-01.
6. **Design Features:** The proposed office building is a six-story steel frame building with a gross floor area of 144,000 square feet and a building height of 85 feet. It is located on the northwest end of the

site facing Lottsford Road and is surrounded on four sides by surface parking areas. Two driveways provide the access to the site from Lottsford Road and Mercantile Lane.

The office building facade consists of two primary features. The main entrances of the building are composed of six-story glass and precast concrete walls with a recessed two-story arcade centered on the front and rear elevations that front Lottsford Road and the rear parking area. The remaining front and sides of the building elevations are a composition of a glass curtain wall with articulated columns and horizontal bands forming a grid pattern that clads the front and rear facades. The roof of the building is a flat roof. The roofline is primarily a straight parapet with a featured arch on the entrance parapet designed to articulate the building entrance glass curtain wall. The building is rectangular in shape with equal lengths on each side. The ground level has an arcade with piers that articulate the building facades.

The office building has achieved a unity of design through compatible materials and colors; selected building materials that are durable, attractive and have low maintenance requirements; and utilize colors that reflect natural tones. The building is constructed and clad with materials that are of a quality that will retain their appearance over time, including precast concrete, aluminum, painted steel and glass.

A signage package was submitted for the office building. The signage is scaled appropriately to appeal to both pedestrians walking on the adjacent sidewalks and to vehicles driving at reduced speeds. The signs are aesthetically pleasing and cohesive. The signage on the street frontages is integrated into the overall design of the buildings. The signs comply with Subtitle 27 Zoning, Part 12, Signs criteria.

Five signage types are included in the package. They consist of the following:

Type A- Freestanding Site Monumental ID Sign

Cast in Place Concrete Wall (or sheet metal finished to match) Color to match building

Recessed sign panel; Color to match building glass

Brass or Chrome Copy

Sign Area: 45 S.F.

Quantity: 1

Location: Intersection of Lottsford Road and Landover Road (MD202)

Type B- Freestanding Site Monumental ID Sign

Cast in Place Concrete Wall (or sheet metal finished to match) Color to match building

Recessed sign panel; Color to match building glass

Brass or Chrome Copy

Sign Area: 26 S.F.

Quantity: 2

Location: Entrance driveway at Lottsford Road

Type C-Building Mounted Building Address
Non-Illuminated 30" High Address Numbers with 3" Return
(Material not identified)
Sign Area: 11.25 S.F.
Quantity: 2
Location: Center Parapet of East and West Walls

Type D-Building Mounted First Floor Tenant Name
Illuminated 10' x 1'-6" Box Sign
(Material not identified)
Sign Area: 15 S.F.
Quantity: 8
Location: First Floor Window Bays

Type E-Building Mounted Major Tenant
4'-4"x 17'-4" x .5" Area for Mounted Letters and/or Logo
(Material not identified)
Sign Area: 11.25 S.F.
Quantity: 4
Location: Center Parapet of East and West Walls

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA:

7. **Zoning Ordinance:** The subject application has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements in the I-3 Zone and the site plan design guidelines of the Zoning Ordinance.

Conformance with Section 27-471. I-3 (Planned Industrial/Employment Park)

The subject application is in general conformance with Section 27-471. Office parks are a permitted use in the I-3 Zone (Planned Industrial/Employment Park). Staff offers the following more detailed comments regarding compliance with the subject section:

The proposed project is in conformance with Section 27-471(a), Purposes. Likewise, the proposed project is generally in compliance with Section 27-471(b), Landscaping, Screening and Buffering (see more detailed discussion under "*Landscape Manual*" below). Section 27-471(c) prohibits outdoor storage, which should not be a problem given the proposed office use. Section 27-471(d) requires that both a conceptual and detailed site plan be approved for all uses and improvements on the subject property. Such a conceptual plan has been approved for the project. (Please see Finding 5, Previous Approvals) At time of detailed site plan review, Section 27-471(d) stipulates that landscaping and the design and size of lettering, lighting and all other features of signs proposed will be evaluated. Section 27-471(e) and the Table of Uses (Division 3, Part 7) include professional offices as a permitted use for the subject property. Section 27-471(f), Regulations, citing requirements in Divisions I and 5 of Part 7, the Regulations Tables (Division 4, Part 7), General (Part 2), Off -Street

Parking and Loading (Part 12), and the *Landscape Manual* specifically requires that not more than 25 percent of any parking lot and no loading spaces be located in the yard to which the building's main entrance is oriented, except a 15 percent increase may be approved by the Planning Board in accordance with guidance from the Zoning Ordinance. The site plan is in accordance with the 25 percent requirement. Additionally, Section 27-471(f), as applied to the subject application, prohibits the location of loading docks on any side of a building facing a street. Section 27-471(g) is inapplicable to the subject application as it establishes requirements for warehousing, not an anticipated use on the subject site. Section 27-471(h) reiterates and expounds on the requirements of 27-455.01 (infra.), stating that each planned industrial/employment park shall have frontage on, and direct vehicular access to, a street having a right-of-way width of at least 70 feet. The proposed project meets the requirements of Section 27-471(i) since the Largo Park development measures in excess of 25 gross acres.

8. **Requirements of the Zoning Ordinance for the Granting of a Variance:** The applicant has requested a variance from Section 27-474(b) to reduce the setback requirements from the street. The request is seeking approval of a 20-foot variance. Staff has listed each required finding for the granting of a variance as stated in Section 27-230 of the Zoning Ordinance, followed by staff comment.

“(1) A specific parcel of land has exceptional narrowness, shallowness, or shape, exceptional topographic conditions, or other extraordinary situations or conditions:”

“(2) The strict application of this Subtitle will result in peculiar and unusual practical difficulties to, or exceptional or undue hardship upon, the owner of the property; and”

Urban Design Comment: The applicant argues that the specific parcel of land has extraordinary situations or conditions that apply to this case. Recent actions have been taken which create a more substantial right-of-way for Lottsford Road than previously existed. The applicant also submits that other combined factors will result in peculiar and unusual practical difficulties to, or exceptional or undue hardship upon, the owner of the property as well.

Staff determined that the quantity of parking spaces provided on the detailed site plan would produce a surplus of 98 spaces more than the required quantity of parking spaces. Twenty-six spaces are located within the required 30-foot setback from Lottsford Road. Removing the spaces within the setback will maintain a surplus quantity of parking spaces, reducing the surplus parking to a quantity of 72 spaces. Staff does not agree with the applicant's contention that loss of 26 spaces on a site with such a large amount of excess parking will result in undue hardship or practical difficulty.

The removal of 26 spaces in the front of the office building facing Lottsford Road will offer the opportunity for a more attractive landscape yard, provided additional trees, shrubs, lawn and groundcover are added to the proposed landscaping. The additional landscape yard will contribute to the enhancement of the gateway to the Inglewood Business Community development at the intersection of Lottsford Road and Landover Road (MD202).

“(3) The variance will not substantially impair the intent, purpose, or integrity of the General Plan or master plan.”

Urban Design Comment: The Community Planning staff has indicated this application for a commercial office building is in harmony with the applicable master plans. Staff does not contend that approval of the variance would substantially impair the intent, purpose, or integrity of the General Plan or the master plan.

9. **The requirements of Conceptual Site Plan CSP-87168/01:** The detailed site plan is in general conformance to the conceptual site plan, CSP-87168/01, approved by the Planning Board on August 3, 1989, with nine conditions. Three conditions of the conceptual site plan are applicable to this review. They are as follows:

1. **A minimum 30-foot landscaped yard shall be provided along the property line adjacent to Route 202 (as required by I-3 Zone regulations of the Zoning Ordinance, Subtitle 27)**

The applicant has provided the required landscaped yard along MD 202. The detailed site plan meets the landscape yard requirements of the I-3 Zone.

6. **Individual trees on site that are worthy of saving will be flagged by staff from the Natural Resources Division and the Development Review Division.**

7. **Every effort will be made to incorporate these trees into the overall building and parking lot layout. This could mean the reconfiguration of the building and parking lot to accomplish this goal. The possibility that drastic overall site grading will be necessary for drainage of surface waters will be carefully reviewed at Detailed Site Plan and would eliminate the tree-save requirement.**

The applicant has attempted to balance the grading needs of the site with the requirements of the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance. The detailed site plan meets the requirements of woodland conservation on the site. For more information regarding this issue, see Finding 13 below.

10. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision:** The detailed site plan is in general conformance with the preliminary plan, 4-98064, and applicable conditions of approval. In a memorandum dated October 2, 2006 (Lockard to Estes), the Subdivision Section offered the following comments with regard to access and trip caps:

The property is the subject of Preliminary Plan 4-98064, approved by the Planning Board on December 10, 1998. The resolution of approval, PGCPB Resolution No. 98-324 was adopted on January 7, 1999. The property is the subject of record plat VJ 189@13. This site was later replatted by record plat 207@96 in 2005 following a reconsideration of the original approval to allow for access to Lottsford Road.

The property is subject to the conditions contained in the resolution of approval, PGCPB Resolution No. 98-324(A), that resolution contains six conditions. There are no conditions related directly to the review of the DSP, but there have been some changes as a result of the reconsideration:

1. Prior to signature approval, the preliminary plat shall be revised:
 - b. To include an access easement across Lot 4 to serve Lot 5, a note that the easement shall remain in effect until Lot 5 is purchased for interchange improvements and a note that the easement is provided pursuant to Section 24-128(b)(9) of the Subdivision Regulations.

The property was the subject of a plat of reservation VJ 161@69 that has since expired. Direct access to both Lottsford Road and Landover Road was denied at the time of the approved preliminary plan. On June 23, 2005, the Planning Board granted a reconsideration and approved a variation to permit direct vehicular access to Lottsford Road. At that time, this condition was removed. The access easement from Lot 4 to the south was to be retained as a secondary access point.

2. Total development of Lots 2 and 3, as shown on the preliminary plat, shall be limited to the general office buildings, which currently exist on the site, or other permitted uses which generate no more peak hour vehicle trips than the uses which exist. Any development other than that identified herein above shall require an additional Preliminary Plat of Subdivision with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities.
3. Total development of Lot 4, as shown on the preliminary plat, shall be limited to permitted uses which generate no more than 414 AM and 552 PM peak hour vehicle trips. Any development over that identified herein above shall require an additional preliminary plat of subdivision with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities.

Conditions 2 and 3 establish caps for development on abutting lots. However, there are apparently no caps on Lot 5 development. This issue should be referred to the Transportation Section to determine if a new preliminary plan is required for future development on Lot 5 based on adequate transportation facilities.

6. **Prior to the issuance of permits for Lot 5, the applicant shall file a new final plat of subdivision for Lot 5 removing the denial of access along the property frontage of Lottsford Road. The final plat shall remove reference to access authorized pursuant to Section 24-128(b)(9).**

This condition was satisfied with the recording of the new plat previously mentioned (207@96).

There are no other subdivision issues at this time.

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

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

12. **Woodland Conservation Ordinance:** The property on which the detailed site plan is proposed is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance because the entire site has over 40,000 square feet of gross tract area and contains more than 10,000 square feet of existing woodland.
13. **Referral Comments:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:

Historic Preservation—In a memorandum dated August 8, 2006, the Historic Preservation Planning Section stated the proposed project would have no effect on designated historic resources.

Archeology—In a memorandum dated August 8, 2006, the archeological reviewer stated that no archeological review is required at detailed site plan.

Community Planning—In a memorandum dated September 11, 2006, the Community Planning Division stated that the application is not inconsistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies for the Developing Tier and that the application is in conformance with the land use recommendations of the *Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Largo-Lottsford, Planning Area 73* (1990) for employment uses. The 2004 *Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Morgan Boulevard and Largo Town Center Metro Areas* contains no land use recommendation for this site.

Transportation—In a memorandum dated November 2, 2006, the Transportation Planning Section stated that the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-98064 governs the proposed Detailed Site Plan (DSP-05014/01) site. While it is noted that the associated resolution includes conditions involving trip caps, neither condition relates to Lot 5. Nonetheless, Lot 5 was created under the 1998 preliminary plan from a partly developed platted parcel recorded pursuant to Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-79155, and while no trip cap is specified, it is a legal and developable lot. From the standpoint of transportation, other traffic studies have assumed the development of 159,000 square feet of general office space on this lot. Since the proposed development of 144,000 square feet of office space is less than the assumed level of 159,000 gross square feet, the Transportation Planning Section would offer no further comment on this issue.

The Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-98064, recommends denial of access to both Lottsford Road and Landover Road. But on June 23, 2005, the Planning Board approved a variation request to permit direct vehicular access to Lottsford Road, in addition to retaining access from Lot 4. As a result, the subject property is proposed to have two access points, one will be via an easement across adjacent Lot 4 and the other via direct driveway onto Lottsford Road.

Review Comments—Variation Request

With this application, the applicant is also seeking approval of a variation from the 30-foot setback requirement along Lottsford Road. The plan proposes only 10-foot setback, or 20 foot less than the required amount. Given the requested setback is outside the established and required rights-of-way for Lottsford Road, the Transportation Planning Section offers no additional comments.

The subject property was given subdivision approval pursuant to a finding of adequate transportation facilities made in 1979 for Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-79155 and reiterated in the approval of the 1998 for Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-98064, as well the 2005 approval of variation to permit access to Lottsford Road.

Subdivision Section—In a memorandum dated October 2, 2006, the Subdivision Section staff listed all conditions attached to the approval of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-98064 that are applicable to the review of this DSP (Detailed discussion of the conditions are in Findings 9).

There are no other subdivision issues at this time.

Permits—In a memorandum dated August 14, 2006, the Permit Review Section offered numerous comments that have either been addressed by revisions to the plans or in the recommended conditions below.

The State Highway Administration stated the following in a memo dated August 24, 2006: “Based upon available information, we have no objection with respect to proposed improvements for Detailed Site Plan DSP-0501/01 and Variance VD 0501/01 approval.”

Environmental Planning—In a memorandum dated September 26, 2006, the case reviewer stated that the Environmental Planning Section has reviewed the revised TCPII for the above referenced Detailed Site Plan and Evaluation Report of Specimen Trees, date stamped received by the Environmental Planning Section on October 20, 2006. The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of Detailed Site Plan DSP-05014/01 and TCPII/136/03-03 subject to conditions listed in this memorandum. This memorandum supercedes the previous memorandum on the subject application.

BACKGROUND

The Environmental Planning Section previously reviewed this site in conjunction with the approval

of the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, 4-98064; Type II Tree Conservation Plans TCPII/136/03 and TCPII/136/03-01; and DSP-05014 and TCPII/136/03-02 for rough grading and infrastructure. Construction of a six-story high office building and associated site development is now proposed.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

As revisions are made to the plans submitted the revision boxes on each plan sheet shall be used to describe what revisions were made, when, and by whom.

- 1. The Subdivision Ordinance provides for the protection of streams, 50-foot stream buffers, wetlands, 25-foot wetland buffers, 100-year floodplain, adjacent areas of slopes in excess of 25 percent, and adjacent areas of slopes between 15 and 25 percent with highly erodible soils. When a property is located within the Patuxent River watershed these features comprise the Patuxent River Primary Management Area (PMA) that is to be protected to the fullest extent possible.**

During the review of Preliminary Plan 4-98064, a Patuxent River primary management area consisting of a stream, a stream buffer, 100-year floodplain, nontidal wetlands, and wetland buffers was identified on Lots 2 through 4, but Lot 5 was previously placed in reservation for planned interchange improvements, although a 100-year floodplain easement was previously recorded for Lot 5 (L. 7307 F. 638). At time of final plat for Lot 5, after expiration of the reservation plat, the PMA was not placed in a conservation easement on VJ 189-13 because it was not delineated during the subdivision review process due to the proposed use.

No PMA impacts were proposed or approved during the review of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-98064 and as such the detailed site plan cannot show any impacts. The revised TCPII correctly delineates the PMA, and no impacts to the PMA are proposed.

Comment: No further information is required with regard to the delineation of the PMA on the TCPII.

- 2. A forest stand delineation (FSD) was prepared in August 8, 1989, and updated on September 10, 1998 for submittal with Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-98064. In a memorandum dated September 22, 1998 from Stacy Miller to Alan Hirsch, it was stated that there were less than 10,000 square feet of woodlands on the site, and the site was therefore exempt from the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance.**

A new FSD was submitted in February 2003, with an application for approval of a Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/136/03, which determined that woodlands on the site had regenerated and that the subject property was now subject to the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance. A subsequent revision to the TCPII was approved on March 15, 2004, to add clearing required for the widening of Landover Road (MD 202).

The FSD identified three separate woodland stands on the site totaling 5.19 acres of woodland. There were five specimen trees noted, of which three were ash trees between 30 and 40 inches in diameter, an American elm with a diameter of 34 inches, and a white oak measuring 50 inches in diameter at breast height. One of the trees is located within the floodplain easement, and the other four are located in the southeast quadrant of the intersection of Lottsford Road and Landover Road.

The final plat for Lot 5, Block B (VJ 189-13) includes the following note:

“3). Development of this property must conform to the conceptual site development plan which was approved by Prince George’s County on 10-11-79 No. P-79029 or as amended by any subsequent revisions thereto, including that variance numbered VP-98054(A) approved by Prince George’s County Planning Board together with Preliminary Plan No. 4-98064.

The Planning Board approved the revised concept site plan for Largo Park (SP-87168/01) on August 3, 1989, which indicated an existing tree line in the area at the intersection of Lottsford Road and Landover Road (Lot 5) and included the following note:

“Mixed hardwoods 50’ – 60’ high (oaks, sweet gums and poplars). Selectively maintain specimens in site integration and lot separation.”

It appears that the intent of the CSP was for specimen trees to be preserved on Lot 5. The revised TCPII proposes to maintain select specimen trees in conformance with CSP-87168/01.

Comment: No further information is required to find general conformance with the approved Conceptual Site Plan SP-87168/01.

This property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George’s County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance because the property has a previously approved Tree Conservation Plan. A Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/136/03 was originally reviewed and approved on August 25, 2003 to allow for the construction of a driveway entrance and stockpile. The TCPII was revised and approved on March 15, 2004 in order to include additional off-site clearing required for the widening of Landover Road (MD 202), and subsequently revised in conjunction with the approval of DSP-05014 for infrastructure and grading only.

The current revised TCPII proposes to clear 2.93 acres of woodland including off-site clearing, resulting in a woodland conservation requirement of 2.52 acres, and proposes to meet the requirement with 0.68 acres of on-site preservation, 0.51 acres of reforestation, and 1.33 acres of off-site mitigation, which meets the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance.

Three areas of preservation were proposed on that plan. Preservation Area 1 was a 0.28 acre area of priority woodlands adjacent to the 100-year floodplain easement and PMA. The current TCPII shows the preservation of priority woodlands (Stand “A”) within the minimum 50-foot-wide stream buffer/Patuxent River primary management area located on the site and as a landscape buffer adjacent to Landover Road.

Preservation Area 2 was located adjacent to Lottsford Road and contains four of the five specimen trees located on the site. The area proposed for protection during construction and preservation includes the on-site critical root zone required to support the survivability of the specimen trees. The TCPII included specific management notes and details related to fertilization and aeration for the retention of specimen trees. A condition of approval, stated in PGCPB Resolution No. 05-148, reads as follows:

3. **When the Detailed Site Plan is revised to allow for development of the site beyond infrastructure, the specimen trees to remain shall be re-evaluated by a licensed or certified arborist. The TCPII shall be revised to incorporate the recommendation of the licensed or certified arborist, which may include, but not be limited to specific management notes and details related to the retention of specimen trees, such as pruning, aeration, fertilization or other appropriate arboricultural practices.**

“An Evaluation Report of the Specimen Trees in Preservation Area 2” prepared by Zimar & Associates and dated October 2006 was submitted. The submitted evaluation report has determined that the four specimen trees were incorrectly located, and incorrectly identified. The four trees were identified as a 41 inch dbh white ash, a 36 inch dbh bitternut hickory, a 30 inch dbh American beech and a 30 inch dbh black gum; the trees were correctly located on the plan, which resulted in minor revisions to the parking layout in order to limit disturbance of the critical root zone.

The condition of the four specimen trees was evaluated, and specific recommendations were made for each tree to enhance long-term viability.

Recommended Condition: Prior to signature approval of the detailed site plan, the TCPII shall be revised to include the specific recommendation of the “Evaluation Report of the Specimen Trees in Preservation Area 2” prepared by Zimar & Associates and dated October 2006, along with a schedule for implementation. Certification from a licensed arborist shall be required at significant points identified in the specimen tree preservation schedule (i.e. placement of tree protection fence, mulching, pruning, etc.)

The final plat for Lot 5, Block B (VJ 189-13) includes that following note:

“No access shall be permitted along Maryland Route 202 and/or Lottsford Road.”

The TCPII shows the location of a major access point onto Lottsford Road.

Comment: The Transportation Planning Section and the Development Review Division will determine whether the Detailed Site Plan can be found in conformance with this plat note. If a revision to the Detailed Site Plan is required to find conformance, which results in a revision to the TCPII, then the revised plan shall be forwarded to the Environmental Planning Section for review and comment.

A revised Stormwater Management Concept Approval 8000070-1992-01 for Largo Park, Parcel 6, Site 3 was submitted, which was originally approved July 8, 1992, and remains valid through July 20, 2007. This approval is based on the old stormwater management regulations, but is grandfathered through re-approval by the Department of Environmental Resources.

It is not possible to verify that the concept approval letter submitted is for the parcel in question, since no plans were submitted, and the case name states that it is "Parcel 6, Site 3."

Recommended Condition: Prior to certification approval of the detailed site plan, a copy of the stormwater management concept approval plan and plans, or other documentation that confirms that there is an approved and valid stormwater management concept approval for the subject property shall be submitted.

Department of Environmental Resources (DER)—In comments dated August 30, 2006, DER stated that the site plan for Largo Park, Lot 5B is consistent with the approved stormwater concept 8000070-1992-01.

Fire Department—In a memorandum dated August 20, 2006, the Specials Operation Command Bureau of Fire Prevention Special Hazards Section provided comments that require incorporation into the final plat and a condition of release of the use and occupancy permit.

Department of Public Works & Transportation (DPW&T)—In a memorandum dated August 16, 2006, DPW&T offered the following:

Frontage improvements in accordance with DPW&T's urban arterial road standards have been provided for Lottsford Road. MD 202 is under the jurisdiction of the Maryland State Highway Administration, who will determine frontage improvements for Landover Road. Full width, 2-inch mill and overlay for all county roadway frontages is required. Street trees and streetlights have been provided along Lottsford Road frontage. The developer will be required to place additional lights and trees in conformance with DPW&T's standards.

Sidewalks are required along the roadways within the property limits in accordance with Sections 23-105 and 23-135 of the County Road Ordinance.

All storm drainage systems and facilities are to be in accordance with DPW&T's and the Department of Environmental Resources' requirements.

A site entrance from Lottsford Road has been constructed under a DPW&T permit.

***The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)**—In a memorandum dated August 28, 2006, staff commented that water and sewer *[extensions would be required. An on-site review package should be submitted and Project DA3882z04 is approved within the limits of this proposed site. In addition, the engineer should submit an amendment review package to add the equestrian

facility and community center to this project] *is available to the site. Additionally, they stated that because existing WSSC facilities are located in the site, a submission should be made to the Relocations Unit at WSSC and provided appropriate contact information. Additionally, they required that an onsite plan review package be submitted because onsite project #890S0061 shows a 10-inch stub for water, proposed on-site pipeline alignments are not shown on the plans and on-site water and sewer piping may impact woodland preservation, reforestation, stream and floodplain area.

14. As required by Section 27-285(b) of the Zoning Ordinance, 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/136/03-03) and APPROVED Variance Application No. VD-05014/01, and further APPROVED Detailed Site Plan DSP-05014/01 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, the TCPII shall be revised to include the specific recommendation of the "Evaluation Report of the Specimen Trees in Preservation Area 2" prepared by Zimar & Associates and dated October 2006, along with a schedule for implementation. Certification from a licensed arborist shall be required at significant points identified in the specimen tree preservation schedule (i.e. placement of tree protection fence, mulching, pruning, etc.)

*Denotes correction

[Brackets] denotes deletion

Underlining denotes addition

2. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, a copy of the stormwater management concept approval plan and plans, or other documentation that confirm that there is an approved and valid stormwater management concept approval for the subject property shall be submitted.
3. Prior to the certification of the detailed site plan, the site plan and elevations shall be revised with the following conditions:
 - a. Provide screening for all rooftop equipment.
 - b. Provide parapets concealing flat roof and rooftop equipment such as HVAC units from public view area. (Provide detailed sections illustrating the height of the parapet and setback of rooftop mechanical equipment that complies with this condition).
 - c. Provide ornamental plant material, such as ornamental trees, flowering shrubs and

perennials, and ground covers at the building foundations.

- *[d. Provide a landscape yard within the 30-foot setback of Lottsford Road and landscape with trees, shrubs, lawn and groundcover.]

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, Eley and Parker voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioner Vaughns opposing the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, November 9, 2006, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 21st day of December 2006.

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:RG:bjs

*Denotes correction

[Brackets] denotes deletion

Underlining denotes addition