



Note: Staff reports can be accessed at www.mncppc.org/pgco/planning/plan.htm.

DETAILED SITE PLAN

DSP-04073

Application	General Data
Project Name: Largo Park, Lot 4, Block B 1401 Mercantile Lane Location: Northwest quadrant of the intersection of Landover Road (MD 202) and Technology Way. Applicant/Address: Gary Rentsch Knollwood Development Corporation 1300 Mercantile Lane, Suite130 Largo, MD 20774	Date Accepted: 1/13/05
	Planning Board Action Limit: 3/24/05
	Plan Acreage: 5.6016
	Zone: I-3
	Dwelling Units: NA
	Square Footage: 92,395
	Planning Area: 73
	Tier: Developing
	Council District: 6
	Municipality: NA
	200-Scale Base Map: 202NE09

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates
Construction of an office building	Adjoining Property Owners Previous Parties of Record Registered Associations: 10/15/04 (CB-12-2003)
	Sign(s) Posted on Site and Notice of Hearing Mailed: 2/15/05

Staff Recommendation		Staff Reviewer: Ruth Grover	
APPROVAL	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS	DISAPPROVAL	DISCUSSION
	X		

March 8, 2005

MEMORANDUM

TO: Prince George's County Planning Board

VIA: Steve Adams, Urban Design Supervisor

FROM: Ruth Grover, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: Detailed Site Plan, DSP-04073
Largo Park, Block 4, Block B, 1401 Mercantile Lane

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 as described in the recommendation section of this report.

EVALUATION

The detailed site plan was reviewed and evaluated for conformance with the following criteria:

- a. The requirements of the Zoning Ordinance in the I-3 Zone.
- b. Conceptual Site Plan SP-79029.
- c. The requirements of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-98064.
- d. The requirements of the *Landscape Manual*.
- e. The requirements of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance.
- f. Referral comments.

FINDINGS

Based upon the analysis of the subject application, the Urban Design staff recommends the following findings:

1. **Request:** The subject application requests approval of an application to construct an office building in the I-3 Zone.

2. **Development Data Summary**

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone	I-3	I-3
Use(s)	Vacant	Office building
Acreage	5.6016	5.6016
Lots	1	1
Building Square Footage/GFA	0	92,395

OTHER DEVELOPMENT DATA

	REQUIRED	PROPOSED
Total parking spaces	234	330
Loading spaces	1	1

3. **Location:** The site is in Planning Area 73, Council District 6. More specifically, it is located in the northwest quadrant of the intersection of Landover Road (MD 202) and Technology Way.
4. **Surroundings and Use:** The subject property is bounded to the north by vacant land; to the west by office use; to the east by agricultural use; and to the south by Kaiser Permanente's doctors office/hospital use.
5. **Previous Approvals:** The subject site is the subject of the following approvals:

Ref. Number	Description	Approval Date
DSP- 79029	Detailed Site Plan	October 11, 1979
DSP-88007	Detailed Site Plan - Rough Grading Only	April 14, 1988
2396-89-G	Grading Permit	March 31, 1989
DSP-88007/01	Detailed Site Plan	May 23, 1991
4-98064	Preliminary Plan of Subdivision	January 7, 1999
PBVJ186, Plat #22	Record Plat	April 13, 1999

6. The proposed project would be entered at two points by a 30-foot-wide ingress and egress easement running from the bulb of the cul-de-sac of Mercantile Lane, a 70-foot right-of-way. The easement runs along the western side of Lot 4 to serve Lot 5 directly adjacent to the subject property to the north. Parking is to be provided on all sides of the five-story office building, with the majority of it located on the Landover Road (MD 202) frontage and the property's northern boundary. Pedestrian walkways are provided at the periphery of the building, but not from Mercantile Lane or along the ingress/egress easement into the site.

The landscape plan indicates planting in accordance with Section 4.2, commercial and industrial landscape strip, along the property's Mercantile Lane and Landover Road (MD 202) frontages. Parking areas are landscaped in accordance with the requirements of Section 4.3 of the *Landscape Manual*.

The front entry of the building faces the terminus of Mercantile Lane and provides a circular drop-off point. The architecture of the building utilizes a mix of pre-cast concrete panels with two-color concrete and reflective glass, except on the first floor where the glass is tinted and non-

reflective. There is some variation in the massing of the façade with regular banding of the concrete above glass.

Two ground-mounted signs are proposed for the project. One is designed to sit on a 5-foot by 14-foot-8-inch monument. The second is designed to sit on a five-foot by nine-foot-four-inch monument. The body of the signs is planned as a cast-in-place concrete wall or sheet metal in a color to match the building. The sign face, measuring 45 square feet for the first sign and 26 square feet for the second sign, will be a recessed surface colored to match the building glass, and the letters of the sign will vary from six to eight inches and will be of polished brass or chrome copy in optima semi-bold font. The copy for the sign will read simply “1401 Mercantile Lane.” The larger sign is proposed to be located in the southwest corner of the site, and the smaller sign is proposed at the second entrance to the site, located at an approximate midpoint on the subject site’s western boundary.

Wall signage proposed for the building includes:

- West Elevation (faces Lot 3, Block B)
 - ▶ 2 major tenant signs under the roof line of the building
 - ▶ 1 address sign “1401” under the roof line of the building
 - ▶ 2 tenant signs on the first floor
- South Elevation (faces Technology Way and Mercantile Lane)
 - ▶ 2 major tenant signs under the roof line of the building
 - ▶ 1 address sign “1401” under the roof line of the building
 - ▶ 2 tenant signs on the first floor
- East Elevation (faces Landover Road)
 - ▶ 2 major tenant signs under the roof line of the building
 - ▶ 1 address sign “1401” under the roof line of the building

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.
 - a. The subject application is in conformance with the requirements of Section 27-473, which governs permitted uses in industrial zones. The proposed office building is a permitted use in the I-3 Zone.
 - b. The proposal is also in conformance with the requirements of Section 27-474, Regulations, regarding additional regulations for development in industrial zones.
 - c. The applicant has, pursuant to Section 27-471(f)(2), submitted a request to the Planning Board that it allow in excess of 25 percent of the parking to be located in the yard to which the building’s main entrance is oriented. Staff has reviewed the statement of justification submitted with this request and finds that it meets the evaluation criteria contained in the Zoning Ordinance.
8. **Conceptual Site Plan SP-79029:** Conceptual Site Plan SP-79029 was approved by the Prince George’s County Planning Board on October 11, 1979, along with Variance VP-98064. The concept plan was approved subject to the following conditions. The conditions themselves are

included in boldface and staff's comments follow.

1. **Arena Drive shall be a 120-foot right-of-way across the southern limits of the property.**

Comment: Though Arena Drive is adjacent to the entire parcel that was the subject of SP-79029, it is not directly adjacent to the subject project site.

2. **No lots shall have direct access to Landover Road or Arena Drive; all access shall be through the proposed internal streets.**

Comment: The proposed project does not have direct access to Landover Road or Arena Drive, but has sole access from Mercantile Lane, an internal street.

9. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-98064:** Preliminary Plan 4-98064 was approved by the Planning Board on December 10, 1998. The Planning Board adopted PGCPB Resolution No. 98-324 on January 7, 1999. The following conditions of approval apply to the review of the subject detailed site plan. Each condition has been listed in bold face type with staff comments following:

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.**

Comment: The proposed development is an office building and creates no issue with this required condition.

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.**

Comment: As per comments dated January 31, 2005, from the Transportation Planning Division, the proposed use conforms to the preliminary plan trip generation caps; future development potential on the site will be extremely limited. Therefore, it can be said that the proposed plan conforms to the requirements of this condition.

4. **The following notes shall appear on the final plat:**
 - a. **An automatic fire suppression system shall be provided in all proposed buildings.**
 - b. **The access easement on Lot 4, serving Lot 5 shall remain in effect until Lot 5 is purchased for interchange improvements.**
 - c. **The access easement on Lot 4, serving Lot 5, is provided pursuant to Section 24-128(b) (9) of the Subdivision Regulations.**

Comment: Although the above notes were required to be attached to the approval of the final plat, by suggestion of the Subdivision Section, they are being repeated in the recommended conditions below.

10. **Record Plat PBVJ186, Plat #22, recorded April 13, 1999:** Record plat notes include that the property is subject to the “Protective Covenants for Largo Park” executed April 27, 1987, and recorded in Liber 6705 at Folio 159 and that development of this property must conform to the conceptual site development plan which was approved by the Prince George’s County Planning Board on October 11, 1979, or as amended by any subsequent revisions thereto, including that variance numbered VP-98064 approved by the Prince George’s County Planning Board.

11. ***Landscape Manual:*** The proposed development is subject to the requirements of Section 4.2, Commercial and Industrial Landscape Strip, and Section 4.3, Parking Lot Requirements, of the *Landscape Manual*.

Section 4.2 of the *Landscape Manual* applies for both the subject property’s Mercantile Lane and Landover Road (MD 202) frontages. The approximately 58 feet of frontage along Mercantile Lane, pursuant to the option chosen by the applicant from the *Landscape Manual* for that frontage, requires 2 shade trees and 17 shrubs. The submitted landscape plan indicates the installation of 2 shade trees and 20 shrubs along that frontage, meeting and exceeding the requirements of Section 4.2. The approximately 444 feet of frontage along Landover Road (MD 202) pursuant to the option chosen by the applicant from the *Landscape Manual* for that frontage requires 13 shade trees and 64 shrubs. The submitted landscape plan indicates the provision of 15 shade trees, 14 evergreen trees, and 70 shrubs for that frontage, again meeting and exceeding the requirements of Section 4.2 of the *Landscape Manual*

Section 4.3. of the *Landscape Manual* applies to the parking area provided for the proposed project. The total area of the parking compound measures 95,260 square feet and the total area of interior planting required is eight percent, or 7,621 square feet. The applicant has provided 7,673 square feet, or 8.05 percent, of interior planting, slightly in excess of the requirement in the *Landscape Manual*. In addition, the applicant has provided 30 trees, in excess of the 26 trees required by the *Landscape Manual*.

Based on the foregoing analysis, the submitted landscape plan is in general compliance with the applicable sections of the *Landscape Manual*.

12. **Woodland Conservation Ordinance:** In comments dated January 28, 2005, the Environmental Planning Section stated that the subject site is exempt from the provisions of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance per S-274-04 for Largo Park, Lot 4, Block B. The appropriate letter of exemption has been issued, and a copy of it was submitted with the subject application.

13. **Referral Comments:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:

Historic Preservation—In comments dated January 19, 2005, the Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section stated that the proposed project would have no effect on historic resources.

Archeology—In comments dated February 7, 2005, the staff archeologist stated that no archeological investigations would be suggested for the proposed project.

Community Planning—As of the writing of this staff report, the Community Planning Division has not offered comment on the proposed project.

Transportation—In comments dated January 31, 2005, the Transportation Planning Section, noting that Mercantile Lane is an existing 70-foot right-of-way and MD 202 is an existing 200-foot right-of-way, stated that access and circulation as shown on the site plan are acceptable. Additionally, the Transportation Planning Section stated that, consistent with prior plans, the credit union approved under DSP-04059 was assumed to generate 121 AM and 375 PM trips. The 92,395-square-foot office would generate 185 AM and 171 PM trips for a total between the two site plans of 306 AM and 546 PM trips. This conforms to the preliminary plan. However, the Transportation Planning Section cautioned that this leaves little room for additional future development under the existing trip cap. In subsequent comments dated March 3, 2005, the Transportation Planning Section, based on additional information provided by the applicant, clarified that the proposed project, when considered together with the adjacent credit union, would not fully utilize the trip cap established by preliminary plan 4-98064.

Subdivision—In comments dated February 17, 2005, the Subdivision Section suggested that since the property is subject to the conditions adopted as part of PGCPB Resolution No. 98-324 regarding preliminary plan of subdivision 4-98064, the general notes should be revised to include conditions 4a-c of that approval. They also stated that the bearings and distances of the 30-foot-wide access easement serving Lot 5 should be indicated on the plan. Lastly, they stated that the Transportation Planning Section should make a determination as to whether or not the proposed development will increase trip generation from the site so as to exceed the trip cap established in Condition 3 of the above approval.

Trails—In comments dated February 25, 2005, the senior trails planner stated that there are no master plan trail issues identified in the adopted and approved Morgan Boulevard and Largo Town Center Metro Areas sector plan that impact the subject site. The MD 202 master plan bikeway is accommodated along the existing paved shoulders along MD 202. With respect to sidewalk connectivity, however, the senior trails planner recommended that the applicant provide a standard sidewalk along the subject site's entire frontage of the 30-foot ingress/egress easement from Mercantile Lane to the northern property lines. A condition to this effect has been included in the recommended conditions below.

Permits—In a memorandum dated January 27, 2005, the Permit Review Section offered numerous comments that have either been addressed by revisions to the plans or in the recommended conditions below.

Environmental Planning—In comments dated January 28, 2005, the Environmental Planning Section stated that the subject site is exempt from the provisions of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance per S-274-04 for Largo Park, Lot 4, Block B. The appropriate letter of exemption has been issued and a copy of it was submitted with the subject application.

Department of Environmental Resources (DER)—In comments dated February 9, 2005, DER stated that the site plan for Largo Park, Lot 4, Block B, DSP-04073, is not consistent with approved stormwater concept plan #8001350-1991-02. Further, they stated that the subject concept approval is for Money One Credit Union and the submitted site plan is for a five-story office sharing the same lot as the credit union. Finally, they stated that the concept would have to be revised to include the office building.

Fire Department—As of the writing of this staff report, the Prince George’s County Fire/EMS Department has not offered comment on the proposed project.

Department of Public Works & Transportation (DPW&T)—As of the writing of this staff report, DPW&T has not offered comment on the proposed project.

Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)—In a memorandum dated February 4, 2005, the WSSC stated that water and sewer is available to the site; that existing WSSC facilities are located on the site, and that an on-site plan review package should be submitted. Appropriate contact persons at the WSSC are provided on the memorandum.

Maryland State Highway Commission (SHA)—In a letter dated February 9, 2005, SHA stated that they have no objections to approval of Detailed Site Plan DSP-04073.

City of Glenarden—As of the writing of this staff report, the City of Glenarden has not offered comment on the proposed project.

14. Staff has reviewed the subject project against the requirements of Conceptual Site Plan SP-79029 and finds it is substantially in compliance. Please see finding 8 for a more detailed discussion.
15. 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.

RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the foregoing evaluation and analysis, the Urban Design staff recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and APPROVE Detailed Site Plan DSP-04073, 1401 Mercantile Lane, Largo Park, Lot 4, Block B, to construct an office building subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to signature approval, the plans shall be revised or additional items submitted as follows:
 - a. A depressed curb or ramp shall be indicated on the site plan for handicap purposes.
 - b. The height of the existing fence shall be indicated on the site plan.
 - c. The applicant shall correct Note 9 to indicate 25 percent green area as the requirement in the I-3 Zone.
 - d. The applicant shall submit evidence that the Department of Environmental Resources has approved a revised stormwater concept plan that includes the proposed office building as well as the proposed bank, the subject of a separate application, on the property.
 - e. Applicant shall include the bearings and distances of the 30-foot-wide access easement serving Lot 5 on the plan.
 - f. The following notes shall be placed on the plans:
 - (1) An automatic fire suppression system shall be provided in all proposed buildings.

- (2) The access easement on Lot 4 serving Lot 5 shall remain in effect until Lot 5 is purchased for interchange improvements.
 - (3) The access easement on Lot 4 serving Lot 5 is provided pursuant to Section 24-128(b)(9) of the Subdivision Regulations.
- g. All references to the size of the building in the plans shall consistently indicate that the building measures 92,395 square feet.
- h. The applicant shall provide a standard sidewalk along the subject site's entire frontage along the 30-foot ingress/egress easement from Mercantile Lane to the northern property line.
- i. The applicant shall submit detailed plans for the proposed project sign, including location and materials, to be approved by the Urban Design Section as designee for the Planning Board. Such plans shall be referred for comment to all parties of record for the subject application.