



*Note: Staff reports can be accessed at [www.mncppc.org/pgco/planning/plan.htm](http://www.mncppc.org/pgco/planning/plan.htm)*

## DETAILED SITE PLAN DSP-02018 and VARIANCE VD-02018

| Application   | General Data                           |
|---|--|
| Project Name<br><br>Greater Morning Star Pentecostal Church<br>(Greenwood Manor)<br><br>Location<br><br>North side of Ritchie Marlboro Road, west of<br>White House Road and east of new Capital Beltway<br>off-ramp<br><br>Applicant<br><br>Greater Morning Star Pentecostal Church<br>4417 Dix Street, NE<br>Washington, DC 20019 | Date Accepted 05/17/2002               |
|   | Planning Board Action Limit 07/26/2002 |
|   | Tax Map & Grid 74 F-4                  |
|   | Plan Acreage 54                        |
|   | Zone I-3                               |
|   | Dwelling Units N/A                     |
|   | Square Footage 25,416                  |
|   | Planning Area 73                       |
|   | Council District 6                     |
|   | Municipality N/A                       |
|   | 200-Scale Base Map 202 SE 08 and 09    |

|  |                          |             |   |          |
|--|--------------------------|-------------|---|----------|
| Purpose of Application   |                          |             | Notice Dates                            |          |
| Church with 1,500 seats and Variance from Section 27-471(f)(2) |                          |             | Adjoining Property Owners (CB-15-1998)  | 04-05-02 |
|  |                          |             | Previous Parties of Record (CB-13-1997) | 05-28-02 |
|  |                          |             | Sign(s) Posted on Site                  | 07-09-02 |
|  |                          |             | Variance(s): Adjoining Property Owners  | 04-05-02 |
| Staff Recommendation   |                          |             | Staff Reviewer: LIZ WHITMORE            |          |
| APPROVAL   | APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS | DISAPPROVAL | DISCUSSION                              |          |
|  | X                        |             |   |          |

January 24, 2013

**MEMORANDUM**

TO: The Prince Georges County Planning Board

VIA: Steve Adams, Urban Design Supervisor

FROM: Elizabeth Whitmore, Senior Urban Designer

SUBJECT: Detailed Site Plan, DSP-02018  
Greater Morning Star Pentecostal Church  
Variance VD-02018

The Urban Design staff has reviewed the Detailed Site Plan for the subject property and presents the following evaluation and findings leading to a recommendation of APPROVAL with conditions.

**EVALUATION CRITERIA**

This Detailed Site Plan was reviewed and evaluated for compliance with the following criteria:

1. Conformance to Conceptual Site Plan CSP-96073 (PGCPB No.97-224).
2. Conformance with Preliminary Plan 4-97107 (PGCPB No. 97-364).
3. Conformance with the Zoning Ordinance and the *Landscape Manual* for a church in the I-3 Zone.
4. Conformance with the site design guidelines as outlined in Part 3, Division 9, Subdivision 3, of the Prince Georges County Zoning Ordinance.
5. Referrals.

**FINDINGS**

Based on the evaluation and analysis of the subject application, the Urban Design staff recommends the following findings:

1. Detailed Site Plan DSP-02018 proposes a church for 1,500 members. The site is located north of Ritchie-Marlboro Road, west of its intersection with White House Road. The site consists of 54.00 acres in the I-3 Zone.
2. In general, the Detailed Site Plan is in conformance with the Conceptual Site Plan CSP-96073 (PGCPB No.97-224) adopted by the Planning Board September 4, 1997. However, the CSP contains two conditions that warrant discussion:

- 3. At the time of Detailed Site Plan review, special attention shall be paid to the following:
- a. Along the eastern boundary, buildings shall not exceed the height limit of the adjacent residential zone, unless a determination is made by the Planning Board that mitigating factors such as setbacks, topography and vegetation are sufficient to buffer the views from adjacent residential neighborhoods.
  - b. A minimum 150-foot building setback shall be required along the eastern boundary. In addition, development or use of the subject property shall be substantially buffered from residential uses by maintaining existing vegetation, where appropriate, and by the use of other buffers and screening techniques, such as fences, walls, berms, and landscaping.●

Comment: The proposed building is centrally located on the site; therefore, this application is not subject to the height restriction stated in condition 3.a of the Conceptual Site Plan. However, the subject property is separated by a large tract of open, flat farmland from the above-referenced residential neighborhood. It should be noted that the adjacent vacant parcel of land has an approved Preliminary Plan 4-02019 which was approved by the Planning Board on May16, 2002 (PGCPB No. 02-101). This approved Preliminary Plan is for 155 single-family lots in the R-80 Zone. The lots abutting the subject parcel are lotted out to the common property line. The subject application is not proposing any buildings within the required 150-foot minimum building setback along the eastern property line. However, a freestanding sign is proposed within the 150-foot minimum building setback (See Finding 5 for further discussion). In addition to the proposed signage, an access easement is required to provide access to the existing parkland to the north of the subject site.

3. The following is the site development data for this site:

|  |                 |
|--|-----------------|
| Zone   | I-3 Zone        |
| Gross Tract Area   | 54.00 acres     |
| Net Tract Area (t property contains no floodplains, perennial streams or nontidal wetlands per Preliminary Plan #4-97107 |                 |
| Max. Building Coverage Permitted   | 45%/24.3 acres  |
| Building Coverage Provided   | 0.9%/.46 acres  |
| Green Area Required  | 25%/13.50 acres |
| Green Area Provided  | 88%/52.97 acres |
| Gross Floor Area   | 20,324 sq. ft.  |
| Use  | Church          |
| Proposed Height  | 44' 9"          |
| Proposed Seats   | 1,500 seats     |
| Parking Required (1 space per four seats)  |                 |
| Parking Provided   |                 |
| Standard Spaces  | 402 spaces      |
| Handicap Spaces  | 9 spaces        |
| Total Spaces   | 411 spaces      |
| *Loading   |                 |

|                              |          |
|------------------------------|----------|
| Loading Required (12' x 33') | 1 space  |
| Loading Provided (12' x 33') | 2 spaces |

|                                     |                 |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Internal Parking Lot Green Required | 10%/4.71 acres  |
| Internal Parking Lot Green Provided | 12.3%/.58 acres |

\*The notes on page 1 of 18 should be revised to include the calculations for Loading requirements.

4. The Detailed Site Plan is in general conformance to Preliminary Plan 4-97107 (PGCPB No. 97-364).
5. The subject plan is proposing the construction of a church with 20,324 square feet of GFA and, therefore, is subject to the requirements of the *Landscape Manual*. The plan is in conformance with the *Landscape Manual*. However, previous conditions of approval (See Finding 2 and 16 for further discussion) mandate that the landscaping for the subject application be examined more carefully to ensure conformance with said conditions.

The proposed building is 100 feet by 168 feet and is 44 feet 9 inches in height from grade and has a portico that extends over the drive aisle creating a drop-off area for pedestrians. The proposed exterior of the building is brick veneer and Exterior Insulation Finishing System (EIFS), which resembles stucco, with a standing seam metal roof. To break up the mass of the building, several reveals have been incorporated into the facade of the building which is articulated on all four proposed elevations. The proposed facade indicates windows which, in their proposed location, create a balanced facade. To provide a cohesive design, the flat roof portico should be revised to include a standing seam metal roof that has a pitch that is compatible with the main building. The colors and size of brick, EIFS, and roof, as well as the pitch of the roof and building mounted lighting details, have not been provided. The plans should be revised to include details of the above-referenced architectural elements of the proposed church building.

Section 27-617 of the Zoning Ordinance sets the requirements for signage. For a sign for an institutional use, the Zoning Ordinance allows a maximum area of 48 square feet with a maximum height of eight feet; the sign may be attached to the building or be freestanding. The minimum setback requirement is 15 feet from adjoining land in any residential zone; however, the approved Conceptual Site Plan stipulates that a minimum 150-foot building setback shall be honored on the eastern property line. It should also be noted that the maximum number of signage allowed is one per street the property fronts on. The applicant is proposing a modified pylon mounted sign. This signage has two pylons and is 23 feet 6. inches in height. The width of the main signage board is 18 feet and it is six feet in height. A secondary signage panel is located approximately two feet below the main message panel. The colors, materials, lighting and landscaping have not been indicated on the detail sheet. No pylon signage exists within the surrounding area and staff is of the opinion that the viewshed of the adjacent residential neighborhoods should be considered in regard to signage. The plans should be revised to include attractive ground-mounted signage in accordance with the height restrictions in the Zoning Ordinance. This signage detail should include but not be limited to colors, materials, lighting, location and a 20-scale landscape plan. This 50-foot-wide easement provides one of two access points to the property.

Conditions 1.e and h in the recommendation section of this report address the above concerns.

6. The Environmental Planning Section, in a memorandum dated June 25, 2002 (Markovich to Whitmore), offered the following comments:

■...The plans as submitted have been found to generally address the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance and the environmental constraints of the site.

■This site was previously reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section in conjunction with a Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, 4-97107, a Conceptual Site Plan, SP-96073, and a Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/67/97, which were approved. Previously approved Planning Board resolutions did not contain any environmental conditions other than the standard conditions regarding Tree Conservation Plans.

■This 54.00-acre site in the I-3 Zone is located on the north side of White House Road at its intersection with Ritchie Road. A review of the available information indicates that streams, wetlands, 100-year floodplain, severe slopes, and areas of steep slopes with highly erodible soils are not found to occur on this property. Transportation-related noise impacts have not been found to impact this site because the proposed development does not include residential uses and the site is not located near noise sources in the vicinity. The soils found to occur according to the Prince George's County Soil Survey include Adelphia fine sandy loam, Collington fine sandy loams, and Sandy land, steep. There are no limitations associated with these soils which should limit the development of this property. According to available information, Marlboro clay is not found to occur on this property. The sewer and water service categories are S-3 and W-3. According to information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Natural Heritage Program publication, entitled ■Ecologically Significant Areas in Anne Arundel and Prince George's Counties, December 1997, there are no rare, threatened, or endangered species found to occur in the vicinity of this property. There are no designated scenic and historic roads in the vicinity of this property, which is located in the Southwest Branch watershed of the Patuxent River basin and in the Developing Tier as reflected in the adopted Biennial Growth Policy Plan.

#### ■Environmental Review

■A Detailed Forest Stand Delineation (FSD) was submitted and approved during the review of the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, 4-97107. The information submitted with this application has clarified the acreage of existing woodland found on the property.

■This property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because the gross tract area exceeds 40,000 square feet; there are more than 10,000 square feet of existing woodland on-site; and there is a prior Tree Conservation Plan approval for this site (TCPI/107/97). The Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII/53/02) revision dated stamped by the Environmental Planning Section on June 14, 2002 has been found to address the requirements of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance.

■This 54.0-acre property has a 15 percent Woodland Conservation Threshold and a 0.18-acre replacement requirement for a total requirement of 8.19 acres. That requirement is being satisfied by 4.69 acres of on-site preservation and 3.50 acres of on-site reforesta-

tion/afforestation for a total of 8.19 acres of Woodland Conservation provided. In addition, the Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCP/107/97, reflected the Woodland Conservation requirements for Lots 2 and 3 of this subdivision to be provided on Lot 1 which is the subject of this application. To address this issue the application provides for 5.11 acres of future afforestation that will be utilized by Lots 2 and 3. A signature block has been added to TCPII/53/02 for the owners of each lot to sign to acknowledge this future afforestation area. •

Comment: Condition 1.a in the recommendation section of this report addresses the notification of adjoining property owners as to the afforestation requirement for Lots 2 and 3. The remaining revisions recommended by the Environmental Planning Section have been addressed.

7. The Park Planning and Development Division, Department of Parks and Recreation, in a memorandum dated June 17, 2002 (Asan to Whitmore), offered the following comments:

■ The Greenwood LLC., a Maryland Corporation, has granted an easement to the M-NCPPC for access to a park located to the north of the subject site. The Deed of Easement is attached for the project file. The applicant shows the easement on the plans, but didn't specify the purpose of the easement. The plans should be revised to state a 50-foot ingress/egress easement to M-NCPPC for access to the park. •

Comment: The plans have been revised and said easement has been labeled as an ingress/egress easement to M-NCPPC.

8. The Community Planning Division in a memorandum dated June 25, 2002 (Fields to Whitmore), offered the following comments:

■ Determination

■ With the information submitted, it is difficult to determine if the proposed development is substantially buffered from the residential area to the east as recommended in the *Largo-Lottsford and Vicinity Master Plan* and supported by the Planning Board in PGCPB No. 97-364.

■ The master plan does not address the requested variance. However, the design recommendations in the master plan demonstrate that the District Council was concerned about the visual impact of development on the subject site.

■ Planning Comments

■ The master plan makes recommendations concerning the subject site. Although these recommendations were written based on the area developing as an employment park, the Planning Board has determined that they are germane nonetheless (PGCPB No. 97-364):

■ Because of the proximity of this employment area to the existing and proposed residential area, special attention is necessary during the design process (M-NCPPC parkland provides a buffer to the north). In order to minimize impacts on nearby residential properties and the transportation system, the following policies

should guide site design:

- \*1. Sole access to the property should be opposite Ritchie Road.
- \*2. Along the eastern boundary, buildings shall not exceed the height limit of the adjacent residential zone, unless a determination is made by the Planning Board that mitigating factors such as setbacks, topography and vegetation are sufficient to buffer the views from adjacent residential lands, and
- \*3. A minimum 150-foot building setback shall be required along the eastern boundary. In addition, development or use of the subject property shall be substantially buffered from residential uses by maintaining existing vegetation, where appropriate, and by the use of other buffers and screening techniques, such as fences, walls, berms, and landscaping.▲

■The Living Areas chapter of the master plan reflects similar setback and buffering concerns.

■No buildings are proposed along the eastern boundary line with this site plan. An access driveway is shown within the 150-foot setback area. It is difficult to determine if the development is substantially buffered from residential uses as recommended by the master plan, with the information submitted.

■The variance is required because the subject proposal is in conflict with the Zoning Ordinance regulation that limits the amount of parking in front of a building on a site in the I-3 Zone. The intent of the regulation is to provide for a more campus-like appearance to an office park. This is accomplished by locating the parking throughout the site instead of having a large expanse of pavement for parking confined in the most visible portion of the site. The master plan does not specifically address the requested variance. However, the above-mentioned design recommendations in the master plan demonstrate that the District Council was concerned about visual impacts from development of the subject site. A guideline in the master plan (Employment Areas Chapter) states that extraordinary attention should be paid to the aesthetics of proposals in the I-3 Zone and adjoining major roads.●

In regard to the master plan requiring sole access to the subject site opposite Ritchie Road, the Transportation Planning Section, the Maryland Department of Transportation, State Highway Administration and the Department of Public Works and Transportation have found the two proposed accesses to the subject site acceptable. It should be noted that previous approvals stipulated that Lots 2 and 3 shall not have direct access onto Ritchie-Marlboro Road. Lots 2 and 3 will be accessed by an easement from Lot 1. Finding 2 and 16 discusses the issues of restricting building heights, views, landscaping, and buffering the eastern property line from the existing and approved residential uses. The request for a variance is discussed in Finding 15.

- 9. The Permit Review and Subdivision Sections had numerous comments which have been addressed.

10. The Transportation Planning Section found the plan acceptable as submitted.
11. The Department of Environmental Resources (DER) finds the plans consistent with the Stormwater Management Concept #968010300.
12. The Department of Public Works and Transportation provided numerous comments which will be addressed at the time the applicant applies for street construction permits.
13. The Maryland Department of Transportation, State Highway Administration, finds the subject application acceptable as submitted.
14. The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC) stated the abandonment of an existing pipeline may be required. The abandonment of said pipeline will be addressed at the time the applicant applies for the relevant permit.
15. In general, the Detailed Site Plan meets the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance for development in the I-3 Zone, except as explained below.

Section 27-471, Regulations, of the Zoning Ordinance sets forth certain design criteria for the I-3 Zone. The Detailed Site Plan is in conformance with the criteria with the exception of Section 27-471(f)(2) which states:

■ Not more than twenty-five percent (25%) of any parking lot and no loading space shall be located in the yard to which the building's main entrance is oriented, except the Planning Board may approve up to an additional fifteen percent (15%) in its discretion if increased parking better serves the efficiency of the particular use; improves views from major arteries or interstate highways; and makes better use of existing topography or complements the architectural design of the building.●

#### VARIANCE REQUEST

The applicant is requesting a variance from Section 27-471(f)(2) in accordance with the criteria set forth in Section 27-230 of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance to allow 100 percent of the parking to be located in front of the main entrance of the proposed building.

Section 27-230 sets forth the following criteria for approval of the variance:

- 1. A specific parcel of land has exceptional narrowness, shallowness or shape, exceptional topographic conditions or other extraordinary situations or conditions.**

In response to the first criterion, the applicant submits that the property has unique topography which presents unique stormwater management concerns. These concerns, as stated by the applicant, include the following:

■ The Conceptual Site Plan does show parking envelopes on the west and north elevations of the building envelope, these parking lots would be located in a different drainage area, increasing the amount of stormwater management measures that would be required of the property owner. (In the previously approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan, a



proposed drainage boundary divides the property into a northern third and southern two-thirds. This boundary bisects the currently proposed building, although a slight modification to the boundary would enable the entire building to be located within the same drainage area as the parking lot).

■It could be argued that all of the parking could be located in the northern third of the property and thus only one stormwater management pond would have to be constructed. However, in doing so, very little space would be left for any additional facilities that the property owner would wish to construct, as the peninsula to the west is already dedicated to open space/afforestation per the approved Conceptual Site Plan, and space would need to be reserved for the stormwater management pond. Moreover, locating all of the parking lots to the west and north of the building is not practical for pedestrian access when the interim main entrance is on the south elevation.●

Staff acknowledges that this site has topographic conditions, that complicate provision of stormwater management facilities and that the proposed ultimate build-out plan and the limited stormwater management capabilities restrict the development of the subject site in a way that justifies granting of the variance request.

Therefore, Urban Design staff concurs with the applicant's evaluation.

**2. The strict application of the Subtitle will result in peculiar and unusual practical difficulties to or exceptional or undue hardship upon the owner of the property.**

In response to the second criterion, the applicant submits that the strict application of the parking location requirements of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance would mean that the property owner's master plan for development would be compromised or severely limited, or that a substantial amount of off-street parking would be deleted, which would be inefficient for a religious institution for the size proposed for ultimate development of the site.

The applicant is proposing a high-quality church building on a well-designed site, which has considerable merit. Staff believes that the facade of the proposed building and subsequent buildings will be perceived, for all intents and purposes, as the main entrance to the complex. The proposed building has incorporated a pedestrian drop-off which, in general, represents the main entrance to a building of this size. Staff is of the opinion that a substantial berm or berm/masonry wall combination with landscaping on both sides should be incorporated into the design adjacent to Ritchie-Marlboro Road. This will ensure that at the time of subsequent reviews, the remaining four buildings (contemplated for ultimate build-out of the site) which will require more parking, the parking lot will be screened from the adjacent roadway and will help to create a campus-like facility. The parking lot is heavily landscaped with large islands and more green space than is required. The loading is located away from any pedestrian activity and has been appropriately screened to ensure it will not be visible from any adjacent residential neighborhoods. The variance requested will not result in a shortage of green space provided on the site. At the time of subsequent reviews for additional buildings, additional parking will be required and additional variances will be required from Section 27-471(f)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance. Staff is of the opinion that failure to approve the variance would create

practical difficulties for the applicant and would frustrate the church's plans for a sort of campus with multiple buildings. However, it is appropriate for the Planning Board to condition the approval in order to mitigate the visibility of the parking compounds from the public street and to give the appearance from the street of a more campus-like development in fulfillment of the purposes of the I-3 Zone.

**3. The variance will not substantially impair the intent, purpose or integrity of the general plan or Master Plan.**

In response to the third criterion, the applicant submits that the church use proposed in this application is allowed in the I-3 Zone and is envisioned in the master plan for this site. The requested variance does not propose any change to the allowed uses in the I-3 Zone and, therefore, does not impair the intent, purpose or integrity of the General Plan or master plan.

The Urban Design staff concurs with the applicant's evaluation.

The Urban Design staff recommends that the Planning Board approve the variance to Section 27-471(f)(2). A variance should be granted to allow 100 percent of the parking to be located in front of the main entrance of the proposed building upon approval of the conditions in the recommendation section of this report.

16. Urban Design Issues: The applicant has provided staff with the conceptual build-out of the site. The proposed church building is the first of five buildings; two of the remaining buildings are to be sited significantly closer to the 150-foot-wide building setback. Staff is of the opinion that the ingress/egress easement and the 150-foot building setback should be landscaped to ensure conformance with the above-referenced condition pertaining to compatibility with the existing and proposed residential neighborhoods to the east. To achieve this, staff recommends that a 21-inch masonry wall, with wood fencing installed on top of the wall with matching masonry pillars six feet in height, should be installed on the eastern property line. In addition, the landscape schedule should be revised to include an increase in the size of plant materials over what is normally required per the *Landscape Manual* to be utilized in Bufferyard 1. Pin Oaks (*Quercus palustris*) are proposed on the western side of the 50-foot-wide easement. To provide a sense of arrival the proposed plant materials on the eastern side of the 50-foot-wide easement should be replaced with Pin Oaks (*Quercus palustris*). These trees should be three to four inches in caliper, planted in a staggered row, on both sides of the easement, 40 feet on center. In addition, a double staggered row of evergreens, including but not limited to: White Pine (*Pinus strobus*), American Hollies (*Ilex opaca*) and Austrian Pine (*Pinus nigra*), 10 to 12 feet in height; understory trees and shrubs should also be incorporated in this bufferyard, and should include but not be limited to: Redbuds (*Cercis canadensis*), Dogwoods (*Cornus florida*), and Japanese snowbell (*Styrax japonicus*) 10 to 12 feet in height; shrubs, such as but not limited to: Mountain Laurel (*Kalmia latifolia*), Rhododendron P. J. M., European Cranberrybush Viburnum (*Viburnum opulus*), and Shadblow Serviceberry (*Amelanchier canadensis*); these shrubs should be 26 to 32 inches and specified as full upon installation.

Preliminary Plan 4-97107 (PGCPB No. 97-364) Condition 4 states that access to Lots 2 and 3, located west of the subject site, shall not have direct access to Ritchie-Marlboro Road; access to Lots 2 and 3 shall be limited to an ingress/egress easement through Lot 1. The access road located

on the western side of the property should mirror the staggered row of Pin Oaks (*Quercus palustris*) located adjacent to the easement on the eastern side of the property. The applicant should seek an easement from the adjoining property owner for permission to plant a staggered row of Pin Oaks (*Quercus palustris*) 40 feet on center adjacent to the easement for Lots 2 and 3.

Conditions 1.a, b, c, d, and e in the Recommendation section of this report address the above concerns.

17. The plan will, if revised in accordance with the conditions of approval, 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.

## RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the foregoing analysis, the Urban Design staff recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and APPROVE DSP-02018, Variance VD-02018, Greater Morning Star Pentecostal Church, and TCPII/53/02, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to signature approval, the following revisions shall be made or information supplied:
  - a. To ensure the adjoining property owner is aware that the afforestation requirements have been satisfied, the adjoining property owner shall sign the appropriate signature block on TCPII/53/02.
  - b. The landscape schedule and landscape plans shall be revised to include an increase in the size of plant materials for Bufferyard One as follows:

Shade trees shall be 3 to 4 inches in caliper  
Evergreens shall be 10 to 12 feet in height  
Ornamentals shall be 10 to 12 feet in height  
Shrubs shall be 26 to 32 inches and specified as full

Plant materials to be utilized shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

### Shade Trees

Pin Oaks (*Quercus palustris*)

### Evergreen Trees

White Pine (*Pinus strobus*)

Austrian Pine (*Pinus nigra*)

American Holly (*Ilex opaca*)

### Ornamental Trees

Redbuds (*Cercis canadensis*)

Dogwoods (*Cornus florida*)

Japanese Snowbell (*Styrax japonicus*)

### Shrubs

Mountain Laurel (*Kalmia latifolia*)

Rhododendron P. J. M.

Shadblow Serviceberry (*Amelanchier canadensis*)

The Pin Oaks shall be planted in a staggered row on both sides of the easement 40 feet on center. The evergreens shall be planted on the eastern side of the easement in a double staggered row with the ornamental trees and shrubs being planted as an understory.

- c. The plans shall be revised to include a 21-inch high masonry wall with wood fence installed on top of said wall and masonry pillars. A details of this wall/fence combination shall be added to the plans. This structure shall be six feet in height, and shall extend the length of the adjoining residential subdivision to the east.
- d. The landscape plans and schedule shall be revised to include three- to four-inch Pin Oaks (*Quercus palustris*) along the easement located on the western property line. The applicant shall obtain an easement from the adjoining property owner to provide Pin Oaks on the western side of the easement. These Pin Oaks shall be planted in a staggered row on both sides of the easement 40 feet on center. Should the applicant be unable to obtain an easement from the adjoining property owner, the Pin Oaks shall be planted in a staggered row 30 feet on center.
- e. The plans shall be revised to include a berm or a berm/masonry wall combination (at least six feet in height), with landscaping on both sides of said berm or berm/masonry wall. This berm or berm/masonry wall shall be located between the parking lot and the proposed commercial industrial landscape strip located adjacent to Ritchie-Marlboro Road. The materials for the wall, should a wall be utilized, shall be of the same materials as the ground-mounted signage.
- f. A note shall be put on the plan stating that no pylon-mounted signage shall be allowed. The signage shall be revised to include a ground-mounted sign with associated details, including but not limited to: materials, colors, lighting, location, and a 20-scale landscape plan shall be included for the area of the signage. This signage shall be in accordance with Section 27-617 of the Zoning Ordinance.
- g. The notes on page 1 of 18 shall be revised to include the calculations to ensure conformance to the loading requirements.
- h. The architectural elevations shall be revised to indicate the following: colors, materials, roof pitches, lighting. The portico shall be revised to incorporate a standing seam metal roof that complements the roof pitch of the main structure.