



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

Detailed Site Plan

DSP-09037

Application	General Data	
Project Name: Horeb Haitian SDA Church Location: Western side of Powder Mill Road (MD 212), approximately 500 feet south of its intersection with Cherry Mill Drive. Agent/Address: Ceepo Contracting, LLC. 6802 Industrial Drive, Suite 204 Beltsville, MD 20705	Planning Board Hearing Date:	12/16/10
	Staff Report Date:	12/08/10
	Date Accepted:	08/24/10
	Planning Board Action Limit:	Waived
	Plan Acreage:	1.69
	Zone:	R-R
	Dwelling Units:	1
	Gross Floor Area:	6,631 sq. ft.
	Planning Area:	61
	Tier:	Developing
	Council District:	01
	Election District	01
	Municipality:	N/A
	200-Scale Base Map:	214NE03

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates	
A 3,302-square-foot addition to an existing 3,329-square-foot residence to establish a 6,631-square-foot church on the property, including a rectory.	Informational Mailing:	12/03/09
	Acceptance Mailing:	08/18/10
	Sign Posting Deadline:	11/16/10

Staff Recommendation		Staff Reviewer: Ruth Grover Phone Number: 301-952-4317 E-mail: Ruth.Grover@ppd.mncppc.org	
APPROVAL	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS	DISAPPROVAL	DISCUSSION
	X		

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL
PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Detailed Site Plan DSP-09037
Horeb Haitian SDA Church

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. Conformance to the following sections of the Zoning Ordinance:
 - (1) 27-441 Uses Permitted in Residential Zones;
 - (2) 27-442 Regulations in Residential Zones; and
- b. Conformance to the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*.
- c. Conformance to the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance.
- d. Conformance to the requirements of Final Plat of Subdivision REP 216 @ 15.
- e. Referral comments.

FINDINGS

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

- 1. **Request:** The subject application is a request for approval of a 3,302-square-foot addition to an existing 3,329-square-foot residence to establish a 6,631-square-foot church on the property, including a rectory.
- 2. **Location:** The project is located on the western side of Powder Mill Road, approximately 500 feet south of its intersection with Cherry Mill Drive.

3. **Surrounding Uses:** The subject property is surrounded by single-family detached residential development in the Rural Residential (R-R) Zone to the north, west, and south; and the 120-foot right-of-way (ROW) of Powder Mill Road (MD 212) to the east, with single-family detached residential development beyond.
4. **Previous Approvals:** The site was the subject of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04110 approved by the Planning Board on February 16, 2006 and memorialized in PGCPB Resolution No. 06-44, adopted by the Planning Board on March 9, 2006. The property is subject to the requirements of Final Plat Book REP 216 @ 15, recorded on October 19, 2006, which supersedes those of the relevant preliminary plan. The site is also the subject of approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan 4800-2008-00 dated December 30, 2008 and valid until December 30, 2011.
5. **Development Data Summary:**

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone(s)	R-R	R-R
Use(s)	Church	Church
Acreage	1.69	1.69
Lots	3	3
Square Footage	3,329	6,630.8
Dwelling Units	1	1
Number of seats in the sanctuary	0	259

Parking Required:

Church	
seats (one space per 4 seats)	65 spaces
Rectory	2 spaces
Total Parking Required:	67 spaces
Number of handicap parking spaces required:	3

Parking Provided:

Church	65 spaces
Rectory	2 spaces
Total Parking Provided:	67 spaces
of which are handicap spaces	3

Parking Space Type	Parking Space Size	Number of Spaces
Standard	8 feet by 19 feet	45
Compact	7 feet by 16½ feet	22 (20 percent of total spaces)
Handicap	9½ feet by 19 feet	3 (with aisle)

Comment: A condition below requires correction, as necessary, of the above schedule in accordance with the requirements of Section 27-558 of the Zoning Ordinance.

6. **Design Features:** The proposed church addition is connected to the existing building in an “L” configuration in the southwestern corner of the site. The architecture of the proposed new addition is compatible with the existing rectilinear structure in color and material, but has an enhanced architectural vocabulary of form and massing, architectural embellishment, and fenestration. Whereas the existing building has fenestration that includes a variety of styles and shapes in a disorganized pattern, the proposed addition has primary central features that are flanked on all sides by additional symmetrical fenestration and architectural detail producing a pleasing architectural composition. Wooden French doors create the primary front entranceway, with a semicircular window and a pedimented roof feature above. A circular decorative window is located above that feature and just below the apex of the roof. The flanking symmetrical window features are set in stucco and pick up the semicircular motif of the window above the front entry doors and provide additional light into the interior. A rectilinear window is located in the upper limit of what would be a first story, with a second decorative window above.

The primary exterior material on both the existing building and the proposed addition is vinyl siding, with fiberglass shingles on the existing portion of the roof, and specified in the same color on the new addition. The rear of the church is largely of the same design, though the existing church structure has an even more irregular pattern of windows in the back, of less decorative style. The same materials are utilized, except for the addition of painted concrete masonry units (CMU) on the watertable and a standing seam metal roof on a nave-like projection on the new portion of the building. Both it and the addition wall on either side are punctuated with double-hung windows. The plan indicates an existing air conditioning condenser approximately midway along the rear wall of the existing portion of the rear of the church, with four similar units located at either end of the new portion of the church. Staff has included a recommended condition below that the air conditioning condenser units be screened.

The new addition predominates on the side elevations of the church. A pleasing pattern of fenestration creates a rhythm to the façades, echoing a similar pattern with rectilinear windows on the first story and rectilinear windows with a semicircular addition above on the second. Both have painted CMUs on the water table, with single-paneled entrance doors.

7. **Conformance to the applicable sections of the Zoning Ordinance:** The detailed site plan is in conformance with Section 27-441, Uses Permitted in residential zones. The proposed church is a permitted use in the R-R Zone. The detailed site plan is also in conformance with Section 27-442, Regulations in Residential Zones.

The application requests parking in the front yard of the church, which is discouraged by Footnote 52 of the Residential Use Table, Section 27-441 of the Zoning Ordinance. The footnote states that “when possible, there should be no parking or loading spaces located in the front yard.” The applicant has posited the justification that siting it in this manner will actually reduce impacts on the surrounding single-family detached residential neighborhoods instead of increasing such impacts as was in all likelihood the assumption upon which Footnote 52 was based. As mitigation for placing the parking in the front yard, the applicant points to the topography of the site, which is depressed in the front yard of the church and makes parked cars somewhat less visible from Power Mill Road. Staff is in support of this justification as the location of the parking in front of the church will generally reduce the overall impact of the parking lot on surrounding residential properties.

8. **Prince George's County Landscape Manual:** The project has been evaluated against the requirements of the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*, as recently revised. The project is subject to the requirements of Section 4.2 regarding the Powder Mill Road frontage and Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, along the northern, western, and southern property lines. The landscape plan references incorrect sections of the recently revised Landscape Manual, but there is sufficient space provided to plant in accordance with the specifications of Sections 4.2 and 4.7 of the new *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*. A condition below would require that the applicant correct the plans to reflect the requirements of the Landscape Manual, with the Urban Design Section reviewing the revision prior to signature approval to ensure conformance with the manual's new requirements.
9. **Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance:** In a memorandum dated November 2, 2010, the Environmental Planning Section stated that the site is exempt from the requirements of the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance because it contains less than 10,000 square feet of woodland and has no previously approved tree conservation plans. A standard exemption was issued for this site on February 12, 2009 and no tree conservation plan is required at this time.
10. **Conformance to the requirements of Final Plat of Subdivision REP 216 @ 15:** The site is the subject of Preliminary Plan 4-04110, Baumann Subdivision. The preliminary plan was originally adopted by the Planning Board on March 9, 2006 (Resolution No. 06-44). The approved preliminary plan included a variation from Section 24-121(a)(3) of the Subdivision Regulations for Lots 1 through 3 to allow access onto Powder Mill Road. The property was recorded in Plat Book REP 216 @ 15 on October 19, 2006. The recorded plat contains eight notes, of which the following plat notes in **bold face** type relate to the review of this application:

3. Development of this site shall be in conformance with the approved stormwater management concept plan and any subsequent revisions.

Comment: In a memorandum dated October 26, 2010, the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) noted that the detailed site plan is not consistent with the approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan (4800-2008), dated December 30, 2008. However, a recommended condition below would require that the applicant provide clarification from DPW&T that the subject plan is, in fact, in conformance with the requirements of the relevant stormwater management concept plan prior to signature approval.

10. The driveway to each lot shall be designed with a turn-around capability in order to minimize the need for vehicles backing onto MD 212. This shall be reviewed at the time of building permit.

Comment: In a memorandum dated September 24, 2010, the Transportation Planning Section stated that the condition above requires that any driveway on MD 212 have a turn-around capability. Further, they stated that, given that the plan now has the two existing driveways serving a circulation pattern within the site, the intent of not having vehicles backing from the subdivision onto MD 212 is met by the site plan and it is nominally in compliance with the condition. The Transportation Planning Section maintained this opinion even when subsequently informed that SHA required closure of the northern access to the property, i.e. that this plan is in nominal compliance with the intent of the condition to not have vehicles backing onto the main roadway.

11. **Referrals:** This application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows.
- a. **Historic Preservation Section**—In an e-mail dated September 21, 2010, the Historic Preservation Section stated that the proposed project would have no effect on identified historic sites, resources, or districts.
 - b. **Archeological Review**—In a memorandum dated September 22, 2010, the staff archeological coordinator stated that a Phase I archeological survey would not be recommended on the subject site. Noting that the current building on the property was constructed in 1954, the archeological coordinator stated that a search of current and historic photographs, topographic and historic maps, and locations of currently known archeological sites indicates the probability of archeological sites within the subject property is low. However, the archeological coordinator stated that the applicant should be aware that there are 15 archeological sites, eight prehistoric, six historic, one multicomponent pre-historic and historic archeological site, two county Historic Sites, the Sellman House (61-012) and the Gallant House (61-013), and one Historic Resource (65-001) located within one mile of the subject property. In closing, the archeological coordinator stated that, pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), a further archeological survey may be required if state or federal monies, or federal permits are required for the project.
 - c. **Community Planning North Division**—In a memorandum dated September 23, 2010, the Community Planning North Division stated that the subject application is consistent with the 2002 *Prince George's County Approved General Plan* Development Pattern policies for the Developing Tier. Further, staff stated that the application conforms to the low-density residential land use recommendations of the August 2009 Subregion 1 Preliminary Master Plan and Proposed Sectional Map Amendment.
 - d. **Transportation Planning Section**—In a memorandum dated September 24, 2010, the Transportation Planning Section offered the following:
 - (1) The applicant is proposing to utilize and expand an existing residence on the site for use as a church. The church is proposed to be 6,631 square feet with a capacity of 259. Access would remain unchanged from the current situation, and that is acceptable. Circulation within the site would allow access to the two large parking areas, and that is also acceptable.
 - (2) The site was subdivided under Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04110, Baumann Subdivision, and the three lots that comprise the site were platted pursuant to that subdivision plan. The approving resolution (PGCPB Resolution No. 06-44) for Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04110 contains two transportation-related conditions stated below.
 - 9. **At the time of final plat approval, the applicant shall dedicate a right-of-way along MD 212 (Powder Mill Road) of 60 feet from the centerline of the existing pavement, as shown on the submitted plan.**
 - 10. **The driveway to each lot shall be designed with a turn-around capability in order to minimize the need for vehicles backing onto MD 212. This shall be reviewed at the time of building permit.**

It is noted that the original preliminary plan considered a variation request for access to an arterial facility, Powder Mill Road (MD 212). Since that time, MD 212 along the frontage of the subject site was downgraded to a collector facility by the Subregion 1 Preliminary Master Plan and Proposed Sectional Map Amendment (SMA).

The variation request, which would not be needed if the subdivision were processed today, limited the site to two curb cuts, one single driveway, and one wide curb cut serving two driveways. Given that the site plan utilizes two curb cuts, it nominally complies with the access scheme envisioned by the preliminary plan.

It is also noted that the original preliminary plan assumed three residential lots. It assumed the retention of the existing residence on a lot with the construction of two additional residences on the two new lots. This development would have generated 2 AM and 3 PM weekday peak-hour vehicle trips. The proposed use as a church would generate 2 AM and 3 PM weekday peak-hour vehicle trips. However, the use would generate 155 Saturday peak-hour trips as well, a trip quantity far in excess of that which would be generated by a three-lot residential subdivision (three Saturday peak-hour trips). While this quantity of Saturday peak-hour trips poses a transportation adequacy concern, adequacy issues are not legally addressed during detailed site plan review. Adequacy would have routinely been addressed during preliminary plan review, but this applicant never indicated any intention to utilize the subdivision to construct a church. Although the subdivision findings in the resolution approving Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04110 clearly indicate that any development other than single-family detached residences was not considered, neither of the transportation-related conditions caps the development on this site.

It is preferable that the adequacy issue would be resolved by means of a new preliminary plan of subdivision, but it is not clear that there is a legal means to cause this to occur. If it is deemed that the site plan can move forward, it is recommended that the site plan be approved with a condition similar to the type of trip cap condition that is normally written at the time of preliminary plan. This condition would prevent intensification of the weekend use and prevent greater trip generation during the critical weekday peak hours. This condition is not written in recognition of an adequacy finding that was made, but rather to prevent further intensification of uses on the site.

As noted earlier, MD 212 along the frontage of this site is a master plan collector facility. Sufficient right-of-way in accordance with the master plan recommendation has already been dedicated.

In conclusion, the Transportation Planning Section deemed the site plan to be acceptable from the standpoint of transportation. They recommended that a condition be approved that would prohibit intensification of the use on this property unless a new preliminary plan of subdivision is approved first.

Comment: The above condition suggested by the Transportation Planning Section has not been included in the Recommendation section of this technical staff report, as the determination has been made that a new preliminary plan of subdivision is not required for the subject project, and there is no legal basis for the suggested condition in the context of a detailed site plan review.

- e. **Subdivision Review Section**—In a memorandum dated March 13, 2009, the Subdivision Section offered the following:

The property is known as Lots 1, 2, and 3 of the Baumann Subdivision, located on Tax Map 18 in Grid B-2, and measures 1.60 acres. The property is currently improved with a 3,329-square-foot, single-family detached dwelling and is in the R-R Zone. The applicant has submitted the subject DSP to convert a 3,329-square-foot, single-family detached dwelling into a 6,631-square-foot church with a rectory and parking.

The site is the subject of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04110, originally adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board on March 9, 2006 (PGCPB Resolution No. 06-44). The approved preliminary plan included a variation from Section 24-121(a)(3) of the Subdivision Regulations for Lots 1–3 to allow access onto Powder Mill Road. The property was recorded in Plat Book REP 216 @ 15 on October 19, 2006. The recorded plat contains eight notes, which supersede the requirements of the preliminary plan. Please see Finding 10 for a detailed discussion of the subject project's conformance to the requirements of those notes.

The Subdivision Section then offered the following plan comments:

- In evaluating the site plan and record plat, there are some inconsistencies. On the site plan, the boundaries of the lots north of Lot 3 are not consistent with the record plat. The northwest corner of Lot 3 on the site plan does match the record plat.
- On the site plan, in the site development analysis, it states that the property is located in Tax Map 19, Grid B-1, which is incorrect. The property is located in Tax Map 18, Grid B-2. This needs to be corrected.
- On the site plan, the general site information section is missing a considerable amount of normally standard information. The general site information should have information about each of the lots on the property, a note on the preliminary plan, a note on the stormwater management concept plan, and a note on the Type 2 tree conservation plan.

Comment: A recommended condition below would address these inconsistencies.

In closing, the Subdivision Section stated that, pursuant to the Subdivision Regulations, a preliminary plan is not required. The approved Preliminary Plan (4-04110, PGCPB Resolution No. 06-44) for the subject property was for three single-family lots. The current DSP for the subject property is proposing to convert the existing 3,329-square-foot, single-family detached dwelling into a 6,631-square-foot church with a rectory and parking on the three lots. The proposed use of a church was not contemplated in the findings of the approved preliminary plan; however, there are no conditions in the resolution of the preliminary plan to cap the use of the three

single-family lots. Since there was no trip cap established at that time, staff recommends that a condition for a cap on the development beyond that proposed should be required with the DSP.

The Transportation Planning Section should provide the appropriate finding and condition for the trip cap with this DSP. There are no other subdivision issues at this time.

Comment: Once a determination is made that a new preliminary plan is not required, the inclusion of this condition would be inappropriate.

- f. **Trails**—In a memorandum dated November 2, 2010, the senior trails planner suggested that the applicant be required to provide funds to purchase and install one “Share the Road with a Bike” sign. However, this is required by Plat Note 7 of Final Plat REP 216 @ 15 and does not need to be made a requirement of the subject approval.
- g. **Permit Review Section**—In a memorandum dated September 2, 2010, the Permit Review Section offered numerous comments that have either been addressed by revisions to the plans or in the recommended conditions below.
- h. **Environmental Planning Section**—In a revised memorandum dated December 3, 2010, the Environmental Planning Section offered the following:

Background

The Environmental Planning Section previously reviewed a Natural Resources Inventory (NRI/016/06) and a Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (4-04110) for the subject property under the project name Baumann Subdivision. The preliminary plan application was approved by the Planning Board (PGCPB Resolution No. 06-44). This application proposes to construct a church and rectory on 1.69 acres of land.

Site Description

The subject site is zoned R-R and is located on the west side of Powder Mill Road where it intersects with Collier Road. A review of the available information indicates that streams, wetlands, and 100-year floodplain are not found to occur on the subject property. Powder Mill Road is classified as an arterial road; however, no residential or residential-type uses are proposed. Noise mitigation is not required at this time. The soil found to occur according to the *Prince George’s County Soil Survey* is in the Sassafras series. According to available information, Marlboro clay is not found to occur on this property. According to information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Wildlife and Heritage Program, 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 adjacent to this property. This property is located in the Paint Branch watershed of the Anacostia River basin and in the Developed Tier as reflected in the 2002 *Prince George’s County Approved General Plan*.

Review of Previously Approved Conditions

The following text addresses a previously approved environmental condition for this site. The text in **BOLD** is the actual text from the previous cases or plans. The plain text provides the comments on the plan’s conformance with the conditions.

Conformance with Preliminary Plan, 4-04110

2. Prior to the issuance of permits, a Type II tree conservation plan shall be approved.

This site is exempt from the requirements of the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance because it contains less than 10,000 square feet of woodland and has no previously approved tree conservation plans. A Type 2 tree conservation plan is not required at this time.

Environmental Review

- A signed Natural Resources Inventory (NRI/016/05) was included in the preliminary plan submittal. Information in the NRI indicates that there are no woodlands on the site.

No further information is required.

- This property is exempt from the Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance because it contains less than 10,000 square feet of woodland and has no previously approved tree conservation plans. A standard exemption was issued for this site on February 12, 2009. A tree conservation plan is not required at this time.

No additional information is required with regard to woodland conservation.

- Subtitle 25, Division 3, Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance, requires a minimum percentage of tree canopy coverage (TCC) on properties that require a tree conservation plan or letter of exemption. Properties zoned R-R are required to provide a minimum of 15 percent of the gross tract area in tree canopy.

The overall development has a gross tract area of 1.69 acres and as such, tree canopy coverage of 0.25 acre, or 10,890 square feet, is required. This project proposes to preserve 60 existing mature trees on the site in addition to planting 15 oak trees. Based on a review of the aerial photographs showing the on-site trees, it appears that the requirement can be met with the existing trees. The tree canopy area of the on-site individual trees can be calculated using the methods described in the Environmental Technical Manual, page D-2.

A copy of the tree canopy worksheet will need to be completed and provided on the plan.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, the landscape plan shall be revised to show a tree canopy coverage worksheet on the plan that demonstrates how the tree canopy requirement is being met.

- A stormwater management concept plan and letter were not included. Submit copies of the concept plan and letter.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, copies of the stormwater management concept plan and letter shall be submitted.

Comment: The conditions recommended by the Environmental Planning Section have been included in the Recommendation section of this technical staff report.

- i. **Fire/EMS Department**—At the time of the writing of this technical staff report, staff has not received comment from the Prince George’s County Fire/EMS Department.
- j. **Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T)**—In a memorandum dated October 26, 2010, DPW&T stated that all storm drainage systems and facilities are required to be designed in accordance with DPW&T specifications and standards. Additionally, staff noted that the detailed site plan is not consistent with the approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan, 4800-2008, dated December 30, 2008.

Comment: A condition below would require the applicant to submit confirmation from DPW&T that the subject plan is in accordance with the relevant approved stormwater management concept plan or any revisions thereto.

- k. **Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA)**—In a letter dated September 21, 2010, SHA offered the following comments:
 - The subject property is located on the west side of MD 212 (Powder Mill Road), a state-owned and maintained roadway, classified as a state secondary undivided highway with an annual average daily trip volume of 23,281 in the vicinity of the proposed development.
 - In order to ensure safe ingress and egress, traffic operations from the proposed site will require closure of the northerly entrance. An access permit for entrance closure, grading within the SHA right-of-way, and modification of the southerly entrance will be required from this office. The permit plans shall be prepared and submitted for review and approval to SHA and should be designed in accordance with SHA standards.
 - SHA requires that right-of-way dedications/donations as shown on the plan be platted to SHA standards. Such plats must be submitted in hard copy format for review, checking, and final issuance. SHA then offered contact information for appropriate SHA personnel for the applicant’s use.
 - Due to the size and scope of the proposed improvement, SHA recommends that The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) require traffic impact analysis. SHA would need six copies of the traffic study for their review and comment.
 - Any utility relocation, adjustment, or connection within the SHA right-of-way would require a permit from SHA District 3 Utility Engineer. SHA then offered appropriate contact information to assist the applicant in obtaining that needed approval.

Comment: In a subsequent telephone conversation on December 6, 2010, a representative of SHA stated that the revised plans showing the northern access closed were acceptable. He suggested, however, that a recommended condition require that a note be added to the plans stating that the northern access to Powder Mill Road was

closed at SHA's request in order to allow the subject project to go forward. Such a condition has been included in the Recommendation section of this report.

- l. **Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)**—At the time of the writing of this technical staff report, WSSC had not offered comment on the subject project.
 - m. **Verizon**—In an e-mail dated September 22, 2010, a representative of Verizon stated that trees and shrubbery located in the public utility easement (PUE) along Powder Mill Road (MD 212) must be removed. A condition below would require that it be demonstrated that the easement will be unencumbered.
 - n. **Baltimore Gas and Electric (BG&E)**—At the time of the writing of this technical staff report, BG&E had not offered comment on the subject project.
12. 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-09037, Horeb Haitian SDA Church, subject to the conditions below:

1. Prior to certification, the plans shall be revised or additional documentation submitted as follows:
 - a. The applicant shall revise the plans to screen the mechanical equipment from all adjacent properties, from all adjacent dedicated public roads, and from all outdoor living, recreation, and parking areas and entrance drives. Such screening shall be by use of a sight-tight fence or wall, evergreen screen, or a combination of the above options. Final design of said screening shall be approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.
 - b. The applicant shall submit to the Urban Design Section documentation stating that the subject plan is in conformance with the relevant approved stormwater management concept plan for the property or an approved revision thereto. Additionally, the applicant shall submit confirmation from the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) that the relevant stormwater management concept plan for the property is a revision of Stormwater Management Concept Plan 4312-2005-00.
 - c. The dimensions and height of all structures shall be included on the site plan.
 - d. The lighting plan for the project shall be augmented from the one street light currently shown on the north side of the driveway apron for the project to ensure that adequate lighting will be provided throughout the site. Final design of such lighting shall be approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.
 - e. The centerline of Powder Mill Road shall be labeled "CL" on the site plan.

- f. The specification for the dumpster fence material shall be revised to read: “a non-white, non-wood, low sheen, durable” material.
- g. The size of the parking spaces shall be revised in accordance with Section 27-558 of the Zoning Ordinance, modifying all 8- by 19-foot spaces indicated on the plan, but not allowed by the Zoning Ordinance. Final design of the parking for the project shall be in accordance with all applicable sections of the Zoning Ordinance and be approved by the Urban Design as designee of the Planning Board.
- h. The general notes shall be revised to include whether a Sunday school is included in the church’s operation. If it is conducted at the same time as a church service, additional parking based on one per four seats in the sanctuary shall be provided. In the alternative, if there is to be no Sunday school included in the operations of the church, that information shall be included in the general notes.
- i. The general notes of the detailed site plan shall be numbered.
- j. The lot coverage calculations on the detailed site plan shall be revised to include the requirement based on the zoning of the property.
- k. The landscape plan shall be revised to show a tree canopy coverage worksheet on the plan that demonstrates how the tree canopy requirement is being met.
- l. Copies of the stormwater management concept plan and letter shall be submitted for inclusion in the case file.
- m. The applicant shall correct references to “Powdermill Road” to “Powder Mill Road.”
- n. The applicant shall add a note to the plans stating that the northern access to Powder Mill Road was closed at the Maryland State Highway Administration’s (SHA) request in order to allow the subject project to go forward.
- o. The applicant shall correct the plans to reflect the requirements of the *Prince George’s County Landscape Manual*, to be approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board, to ensure conformance with revised requirements effective December 13, 2010.