



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

Detailed Site Plan

DSP-12005

| Application | General Data | |
|--|------------------------------|----------------|
| Project Name: Crestview Square Shopping Center Location: Eastern corner of the intersection of Annapolis Road (MD 450) and Cooper Lane Applicant/Address: BBV Crestview Square, LLC. 7250 Woodmont Avenue, Suite #350 Bethesda, MD 20814 | Planning Board Hearing Date: | 10/04/12 |
| | Staff Report Date: | 09/25/12 |
| | Date Accepted: | 05/17/12 |
| | Planning Board Action Limit: | Waived |
| | Plan Acreage: | 7.28 |
| | Zone: | M-U-I |
| | Dwelling Units: | N/A |
| | Gross Floor Area: | 76,518 sq. ft. |
| | Planning Area: | 69 |
| | Tier: | Developed |
| | Council District: | 05 |
| | Election District | 02 |
| | Municipality: | Landover Hills |
| | 200-Scale Base Map: | 205NE06 |

| Purpose of Application | Notice Dates | |
|---|------------------------|----------|
| This case was continued from the Planning Board hearing date of September 13, 2012 to October 4, 2012 The addition of a 6,347-square-foot retail building within the Crestview Square Shopping Center. | Informational Mailing: | 020/2/12 |
| | Acceptance Mailing: | 05/14/12 |
| | Sign Posting Deadline: | 07/03/12 |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--|------------|
| Staff Recommendation | | Staff Reviewer: Meika Fields Phone Number: 301-780-2458 E-mail: Meika.Fields@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-12005
Crestview Shopping Center

The Urban Design staff has completed its review of the subject application and appropriate referrals. The following evaluation and findings lead to a recommendation of APPROVAL with conditions, as described in the Recommendation Section of this report.

EVALUATION

This detailed site plan was reviewed and evaluated for compliance with the following criteria:

- a. The requirements of the 2010 *Central Annapolis Road Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment*;
- b. The requirements of the Zoning Ordinance in the Mixed-Use-Infill (M-U-I) Zone and the Development District Overlay (D-D-O) Zone;
- c. The requirements of Record Plat WWW 60-84;
- d. The requirements of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*;
- e. The requirements of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance;
- f. The requirements of the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance; and
- g. Referrals.

FINDINGS

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

1. **Request:** The subject detailed site plan (DSP) is for the addition of a 6,347-square-foot retail building within the Crestview Square Shopping Center. The entire area of the subject legally described parcel, Parcel D, is the subject of the detailed site plan.

2. **Development Data Summary:**

| | Existing | Proposed |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Zone | M-U-I/DDOZ | M-U-I/DDOZ |
| Total Site Area | 7.28 acres | 7.28 acres |
| Total Building Gross Floor Area (GFA) | 70,171 sq. ft. | 76,518 sq. ft. |
| of which Shopping Center | 67,291 sq. ft. | 67,291 sq. ft. |
| Pizza Hut | 2,880 sq. ft. | 2,880 sq. ft. |
| Proposed Retail Building | - | 6,347 sq. ft. |

Other Development Data:

Parking:

| Required | Proposed |
|-------------------|-----------------|
| 307 spaces (max.) | 413 |
| 154 spaces (min.) | |

The development on the subject site meets the definition of an integrated shopping center. Per Section 27-568(a) of the Zoning Ordinance, one parking space is required per 250 square feet of gross floor area (GFA) within the shopping center. Per the 2010 *Central Annapolis Road Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (SMA), the maximum number of parking spaces shall be equal to the minimum required by Section 27-568(a) of Part 11 of the Zoning Ordinance, and the minimum number of surface parking spaces shall be 50 percent of the maximum number of parking spaces. The parking provided requires an amendment of the development district standards for parking. Additional analysis is provided in Finding 7(c).

3. **Location:** The subject property is located at the eastern quadrant of the intersection of Annapolis Road (MD 450) and Cooper Lane in the Developed Tier. It is located in Council District 5 and Planning Area 69 in the municipality of Landover Hills. The address is 6611 Annapolis Road, Hyattsville, Maryland.
4. **Surrounding Uses:** The subject property is surrounded by a mix of commercial and residential uses. The property is bordered to the northwest by the Annapolis Road (MD 450) right-of-way and to the southwest by the Cooper Lane right-of-way. Beyond Annapolis Road are properties in the Mixed-Use-Infill (M-U-I) Zone and Development District Overlay (D-D-O) Zone of the 2010 *Central Annapolis Road Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* developed with a mix of commercial and institutional uses including a bowling alley, laundromat, church, and a filling station. The property is bordered to the northeast by a day care center in the M-U-I and D-D-O-Z Zone. Southeast of the subject site is Multifamily Medium-Density Residential (R-18)-zoned property known as the Ashford at Cooper's Crossing apartments, which is Parcel A, Block 19 of the Landover Estates Subdivision. South of the subject site is a Townhouse (R-T)-zoned, townhome development known as Cooper's Landing. Southwest of the subject property along Annapolis Road are Commercial Shopping Center (C-S-C) and D-D-O-zoned properties, namely the Capital Plaza Mall. Beyond the immediate property vicinity are One-Family Detached Residential (R-55)-zoned properties.
5. **Previous Approvals:** There are no previous Planning Board approvals for the subject property. The Crestview Shopping Center was developed in 1971, according to the Maryland Department of Assessments and Taxation. At that time, the strip-style shopping center and two pad sites were constructed. Currently, only one pad site exists, a Pizza Hut, which was developed in 1985.

6. **Design Features:** The subject application proposes the construction of a one-story, 6,347-square-foot retail building for four retail and/or restaurant tenants in the southwest portion of the existing parking lot of the Crestview Shopping Center. A drive-aisle and surface parking are proposed on all sides of the proposed building.

Architecture

The application proposes a one-story brick building with four well-articulated façades. The building materials are predominantly buff-colored brick and a dark brown brick at the base of the building. Areas of recessed brick panel are proposed within the southeast and northeast building elevations to provide a consistent building fenestration. Glass and metal components are integrated within each building elevation through the proposed storefront windows, display windows, and tenant storefront entrances. While the base of the building appears well-defined, the top of the building lacks some definition. The sector plan specifies that a decorative commercial cornice and/or parapet should be provided. Prior to signature approval of the plans, the architecture should be revised to indicate a consistent and attractive cornice or parapet treatment.

The main building elevations are directed towards Annapolis Road and Cooper Lane. Within these elevations, expanded glass and metal entry canopies are proposed, which extend approximately 3 feet to 4.5 feet above the main building height, and add more prominence to those building elevations. The average building height is 15 feet, with portions of entrance features extending to 19.5 feet in height.

Site Features

On July 17, 2012, the applicant submitted a schematic site and landscape plan indicating additional improvements to the site features around the proposed building. The schematic site and landscape plan indicates the use of: decorative concrete paving around the building pad, planters with seating walls, and crosswalks utilizing colored asphalt paving. Details of these features have not been provided on the most recently submitted detailed site plan. Staff believes these features are an improvement to the site plan and recommends that the detailed site plan be revised to specify the use of these features, and provide details for them.

A detail for a durable, non-wood trash enclosure should also be provided for the proposed dumpster. The enclosure should include masonry materials complementary to those used in the construction of the proposed building.

Signage

The subject application proposes new building-mounted signage. Individual painted channel letters and face-lit channel letters mounted directly on a raceway are proposed. The proposed signage appears appropriate in dimension and style. Prior to signature approval of the plans, the site plan should be revised to dimension the proposed building-mounted signage areas.

Landscaping

Minimal landscape improvements currently exist on the subject lot, which is largely paved with a few existing landscaped areas. The site was constructed in 1971 prior to the current parking lot interior planting requirements; therefore, all of the existing landscape areas are located at the perimeter of the site. A substantial increase in landscaping and vegetative area is recommended as a part of the subject approval in order to improve the existing site conditions and place the shopping center in more substantial conformance with the requirements of the 2010 *Central Annapolis Road Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* and the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance. Due to the significant investment in landscaping that is recommended to place the site in better conformance with the 2010 *Central Annapolis Road Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* and the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance, and the relatively limited scope of the

subject development application, staff recommends approval of a phased landscape plan for this application. Additional discussion of the site's conformance to the various landscape requirements is provided in Findings 7 and 12 below.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **The Central Annapolis Corridor and Development District Overlay Zone (D-D-O-Z):** The subject site is located within the Mixed-Use Transition area of the Central Annapolis Road Corridor. The 2010 *Central Annapolis Road Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (SMA) defines the purpose of the Mixed-use Transition Area, as follows:

The purpose of the Mixed-use Transition Area is to promote medium-density mixed-use with a residential character along segments of Annapolis Road currently occupied by underutilized strip commercial development. The Mixed-use Transition Area will include a mix of commercial, mixed-use, and multifamily development. Development controls for this area aim to create viable residential blocks and active commercial uses that are responsive to local needs and access. (Page 8.149)

The sector plan includes illustrative drawings of the long-term redevelopment of the subject commercial shopping center site. Block-style development of multifamily buildings with ground floor retail fronting Annapolis Road (MD 450) and Cooper Lane are included in the long term vision. A new access road between Cooper Lane and 68th Place and a neighborhood-scaled park are discussed as a strategy for the further improvement of the subject area. The sector plan rezoned the subject commercial shopping center site from the Commercial Shopping Center (C-S-C Zone) to the Mixed-Use-Infill (M-U-I) Zone to further implement the vision of the plan. Full realization of the sector plan vision for this area will not likely be achieved until the entire shopping center site is razed and redeveloped at some future date. A comprehensive redevelopment of the subject site is not currently proposed. Many of the improvements recommended by the sector plan are impeded by the existing conditions on the subject site, such as buildings, structures and features.

The subject site is a commercial shopping center, and the applicant proposes the continuation and expansion of the existing commercial use. Since a site plan has been submitted, the entire development is required to comply with the intent and the development district standards of the Central Annapolis Road Corridor Plan. There are no exemptions in the Central Annapolis Road Corridor Plan for the existing structures on the Crestview Shopping Center site once a site plan is submitted. Compliance with the applicable standards has been evaluated as a part of the detailed site plan process.

In accordance with Section 27-548.25 of the Zoning Ordinance, in approving the detailed site plan, the Planning Board must find that the site plan meets applicable Development District Standards. If the applicant so requests, the Planning Board may apply development standards which differ from the Development District Standards, most recently approved or amended by the District Council, unless the sectional map amendment text specifically provides otherwise. The Planning Board must find that the alternate Development District Standards will benefit the development and the Development District and will not substantially impair implementation of the Master Plan, Master Plan Amendment, or Sector Plan.

Due to existing improvements on the site that were constructed in the 1970's and 1980's, a large number of amendments of development district standards is needed, and have been requested by the applicant. At this time, staff believes that many of the requested amendments are warranted, as the current proposal for a one-story, freestanding, 6,347-square-foot retail building only represents an increase in gross floor area (GFA) of eight percent on the subject site. To require

more substantial conformance with the development district standards for all of the existing structures and conditions on the site at this time would be a hardship for the applicant. Staff, therefore, recommends that the site be evaluated for its ability to conform to development district standards more fully at the time of each future redevelopment proposal.

The applicant requests amendments of the following development district standards:

a. **Mixed-use Transition Area Bulk Table (Standard 3.a)** (as revised per CR-100-2010)

| PRIMARY FRONTAGE TYPE | MIXED-USE ARTERIAL |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Front Building Placement Line | |
| Minimum | 80' |
| Maximum | 85' for buildings, with non-residential uses OR buildings on corner lots, otherwise 90'* |
| Corner Side Yard | |
| Minimum | 0' |
| Maximum | 5' |

The Development District standards identify the minimum and maximum building placement line for any non-residential use, as 80 and 85 feet, measured from the existing centerline of Annapolis Road, and 0 and 5 feet from Cooper Lane.

Applicant's Justification: The applicant provided the following justification for the amendment request:

“The Applicant respectfully requests an amendment to the bulk and yard standards stated in the Development District Overlay of the Sector Plan.... The proposed building has been sited on the same location as a previously existing building in order to take advantage of the existing infrastructure such as utilities and parking. The proposed building will have commercial space available for several tenants. Each retail establishment within the building requires access to a parking lot in front of the establishment for commercial success. Thus, the building must be placed with enough space to maintain the full 360 degree circulation and parking. The building in the proposed development has been placed at 53' from the side property line. The building cannot be placed between 0 and 5' from the side property line as that is the location that public utility easements are traditionally required.”

Comment: The proposed building is indicated in a similar location as a bank that was previously constructed on the subject site in 1971. During plan review, staff requested that the applicant make plan modifications to move the building closer to the building placement lines. The applicant has made some concessions, including the proposal to remove one row of existing parking that is currently located perpendicular to the Annapolis Road right-of-way. While revisions have been made to improve the site's frontage, the building has not been located closer to the street, and an amendment is still requested from the Bulk Area Table.

It is staff's preference that the building be placed at the building placement line along Annapolis Road. All of the tenant spaces have two fronts. If it is a requirement for leasing that each tenant space have parking and vehicular access proximate to the tenant storefront, it appears that this

aspect of the building program requirement could still be met with parking and vehicular access on three sides of the proposed building instead of all four.

However, the applicant asserts that locating the building at the building placement lines will make the building economically non-viable and unattractive for future tenants. As the economic success of the subject proposal is closely linked to the applicant's ability to improve the existing conditions on the overall subject site, staff believes an amendment request can be supported.

b. Parking Lot Requirements

The follow development district standards apply:

Parking and access management (Standard 3.b(1))

No parking shall be located in the front yard or corner side yard.

Parking and access management (Standard 3.b (2))

For parking in the interior side yard, one double-loaded parking aisle is permitted for lots with 150 feet or more of frontage, provided the parking is setback from the primary building façade a minimum of 10 feet and is screened in accordance with the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*.

Comment: Amendments to the above Development District Overlay Standard are needed. The existing and proposed conditions do not eliminate the large parking fields on the subject site. Staff believes that the requested amendments should be approved, as the subject proposal reduces parking along the site's Annapolis Road frontage.

c. Parking and access management (Standard 3.b(5))

These minimum and maximum parking capacity regulations apply in the Mixed-Use Transition Area:

- (b) For commercial uses, the minimum required onsite parking capacity shall be 50 percent of the current required minimum capacity as determined in Section 27-568(a). The permitted maximum capacity shall be equal to the required minimum capacity typically required for all uses.**

Number of parking spaces required and provided for the subject site:

| Required | Proposed |
|-------------------|-----------------|
| 307 spaces (max.) | 413 |
| 154 spaces (min.) | |

Applicant's Justification: The applicant provided the following justification for the amendment request:

"While the proposed development exceeds the maximum number of parking spaces allowed per this section, the additional parking spaces are being reestablished in an effort to provide the amount of parking that was previously available to the center so that no real net loss is suffered as this would be considered a hardship to the existing businesses already operating on the site.

Originally the site had 471 spaces. This retail addition to the property requires the elimination of 30 existing parking stalls that were optimally located.”

Comment: Per the applicable D-D-O-Z parking standards, the maximum parking allowed for any commercial development is equal to the minimum parking capacity as determined using the procedures outlined in Section 27-568(a) of the Zoning Ordinance. The submitted plan shows a total of 413 spaces, which are approximately 106 spaces more than the number of spaces allowed by the D-D-O-Z parking standards. It is equally important to note that the proposed 413 spaces shown on the plan is 88 spaces fewer than the 501 parking spaces that currently exist on the site and was shown in a Use and Occupancy permit issued in October 2011.

Staff recommends approval of the amendment request.

d. **Street Trees (Standard 6.c)**

Street trees shall be provided along all streets to enhance and soften building façades, create street character, and provide shade for pedestrian street level activity. Street trees shall be planted at the time of development and spaced 30 feet apart on center.

Applicant’s Justification: The applicant provided the following justification for the amendment request:

“The Applicant seeks this amendment to the Street Tree Development Standard along Annapolis Road because (1) overhead powerlines along the Annapolis Road frontage could make planting street trees a safety hazard, (2) the grade changes along the frontage of Crestview Square Shopping Center would make planting street trees an incredible hardship, and (3) the existing retaining wall already along the Annapolis Road frontage makes planting street trees impractical.”

Comment: The site plan indicates substantial conformance with this requirement. Sufficient planting area is available along Cooper Lane and the applicant proposes to plant Pin Oak trees along Cooper Lane in accordance with sector plan and the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) standards. Where space is limited within the Annapolis Road right-of-way, a mix of ornamental and shade trees is proposed, as space provides. This landscape design shown on the DSP will provide shade for pedestrian street-level activity. Furthermore, the sector plan envisions additional area for landscape buffers, once a road diet is implemented for Annapolis Road.

Staff recommends approval of the amendment request.

The landscape plan locates eight proposed River Birch trees along Annapolis Road in an area that is encumbered by a retaining wall with a concrete pad. Prior to signature approval of the plans, the landscape architect should clarify if the proposed trees are a drafting error, or if the existing concrete pad is to be removed.

e. **Parking Lot Requirements (Standard 6.d)**

A landscaped strip consisting of a minimum four-foot wide landscaped strip between the right-of-way line and the parking lot, with a brick, stone, or finished concrete wall between three and four feet in height shall be provided to screen the parking lot. The wall shall be located adjacent to but entirely outside the four-foot-wide landscaped strip. Plant with a minimum of one shade tree per 35 linear feet of frontage, excluding driveway openings, and with a mixture of evergreen groundcover and low shrubs planted between the shade trees.

A minimum of nine percent of the lot must be interior planting area.

Applicant's Justification: The applicant provided the following justification for the amendment request from the parking lot requirements:

“The Applicant respectfully requests an amendment to the parking lot development district standards. Crestview Square Shopping Center has existed for at least 40 years. The shopping center was developed in compliance with the regulatory standards that existed at the time the building was constructed. Consistent with the requirements at the time of construction, the owner developed and paved the entire parcel of land. The paving in the parking lot extends up to the public right-of-way. Also due to grade changes on the parcel a retaining wall was constructed along a portion of the Annapolis Road frontage, which provides some screening to the parking lot from Annapolis Road. Thus, the Applicant requests an amendment from the parking lot standards and asserts that the alternative standards, as depicted on the submitted Detailed Site Plan, will benefit the development and will not substantially impair the implementation of the plan.”

Comment: The site plan indicates that the parking lot is adjacent to the right-of-way for 1,082 linear feet; therefore 31 shade trees and shrubs are required pursuant to the sector plan. The landscape plan provides for 21 shade trees and shrubs between the right-of-way and parking lot. Additional low shrubs should be provided adjacent to the Cooper Lane and Annapolis Road right-of-way in accordance with the sector plan standards. Staff acknowledges that there is one location at the center of the site's frontage that has a steep slope that is paved. Additional shrub plantings may not be feasible in this location.

A low masonry wall to screen the parking lot is not currently indicated on the site plan, as required by the sector plan. Staff agrees that in some locations grade changes and an existing retaining wall significantly reduce the need for an additional low wall. This is not the case at the southwest corner of the site where the new building is proposed. Staff recommends that a low brick wall be provided on the subject site to screen the parking proposed between the new retail building and the Annapolis Road and Cooper Lane rights-of-way. Alternatively, the applicant could remove the parking and vehicular access between the proposed building and the rights-of-way.

The sector plan states that a minimum of nine percent of the parking lot must be interior planting area. The Crestview Shopping Center was originally constructed with negligible interior planting area. For the 208,184-square-foot parking lot, 18,737 square feet of interior green is required. A total of 7,841 square feet or 3.7 percent of interior planting area to be planted with 41 shade trees is provided in a phased planting plan. Staff recommends that seven additional interior planting islands with 14 additional shade trees be provided to indicate greater conformance with the sector plan standard and provide a more balanced and attractive distribution of shade trees within the parking lot. With the addition of the recommended planting islands, approximately 10,081 square feet of interior planting area would be provided on the site or 4.8 percent. Staff recommends approval of the amendment request for a reduction in the interior planting requirement.

f. Screening Requirements (Standard 6.e)

Dumpsters and storage, service, loading, and delivery areas shall be hidden from public streets, walks, and from all adjacent property containing residential, commercial, and mixed-uses by utilizing landscaping, buffer walls, or other methods to screen the equipment.

Comment: Staff does not recommend approval of an amendment request from Standard 6.e. Existing dumpster and loading areas should not be a nuisance to adjacent residential properties. The site plan should demonstrate screening of dumpsters and loading from adjacent residential properties through proposed landscaping and opaque fencing at the southeast property line prior to signature approval of the plans. The additional screening treatment should be provided between the existing parking lot, where loading and transformers are located, and the adjacent property line. Also, the proposed loading space should be relocated out of the drive aisle proximate to the site's Cooper Lane entrance to an area less visible from the right-of-way; or it should be eliminated from the proposal. The quantity of provided loading spaces should be correct on the approved site plan.

g. **Buffering Incompatible Uses (Standard 6.g)**

The minimum bufferyard requirements (landscape yard) for incompatible uses in the Landscape Manual (Section 4.7) may be reduced by 50 percent. The number of plant units required per 100 linear feet of property line or right-of-way may also be reduced by 50 percent. A four-foot-high, opaque masonry wall or other opaque screening treatment shall be provided in conjunction with the reduced width of the bufferyard between office/retail/commercial uses and residential uses.

Comment: The site abuts two incompatible uses. The property is bordered to the northeast by a day care center in the M-U-I Zone. Southeast of the subject site is Multifamily Medium-Density Residential (R-18)-zoned property known as the Ashford at Cooper's Crossing apartments.

According to the sector plan, a landscape buffer is required between the adjacent daycare use to the north and the subject property. The above sector plan standard references the requirements of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*. The 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* states that if all or any part of the buffer has been provided on the adjacent property, was required by the Landscape Manual, and is shown on a landscape plan approved in accordance with this section, the proposed use may provide only that amount of the buffer that has not been provided on the adjacent property. The adjacent daycare use was approved pursuant to Detailed Site Plan DSP-94038-02. On that approval, Type 'A' buffering inclusive of a ten-foot-wide landscape yard was required and demonstrated. The southeast portion of the daycare site is wooded. A retaining wall and opaque fence also exists between these properties, limiting visibility and eliminating connection between the two sites. Staff does not believe that any further landscaping is required along this property line.

According to the sector plan a 20-foot-wide landscape buffer is required between the adjacent multifamily use and the subject property. The landscape plan shows an existing variable width landscape buffer between the shopping center and the adjacent residential property to the southeast. The buffer is generally 20-foot-wide and narrows to approximately five feet in the area of the southeastern parking lot. A grade change with a retaining wall exists along this property line. The retaining wall functions as a screening treatment; therefore a 50 percent reduction in the required bufferyard is supported for the portion of the property line where the wall exists. Staff believes an amendment request is supportable along the southeast property line due to: the existing building location; the existing change in grade between the subject site and the adjacent residential development, which provides additional screening; and the location of existing parking which is not proposed to be modified at this time. The standard 6.g schedule provided on the landscape plan should be revised to indicate the area within the required buffer that is occupied by existing woodland, which reduces the amount of new plant material required. In the area where the bufferyard is further reduced, the applicant proposes five additional shade trees and one ornamental tree. If fencing is added at this property line to meet the requirements of the sector plans' screening standards, the intent of this standard will be more completely satisfied.

As redevelopment occurs more proximate to these property lines, the site plan should be reevaluated for conformance to the Buffering Incompatible Uses requirements.

h. **Streetscape Elements (Standard 6.h)**

All streetscape elements shall be required for all streets and shall include information of location, spacing, quantity, construction details, and method of illumination in accordance with the plan's recommended streetscape sections and public realm elements.

Streetscape elements shall include:

- **Street trees (located in tree pits or continuous planting strips along major streets and planting beds along residential streets). Street trees planted in pits or planting beds shall be interconnected under the paving to provide continuous soil area for tree roots. These pits or planting beds shall be no less than 5 feet in width/ diameter in any direction.**
- **Street furniture (benches, trash receptacles, lighting, and bus shelters)**
- **Landscaping and planters**
- **Decorative paving**
- **Sculpture/artwork**

Comment: Full conformance with this standard cannot be required at this time. Streetscape elements should be fully provided once frontage improvements are required. The subject 6,347-square-foot proposal does not subject the site to the full frontage improvements in accordance with the sector plan standards; therefore, implementation of all of the streetscape elements at this time is not appropriate. Staff does acknowledge a few items should be addressed to improve the existing streetscape.

Among the stated strategies for transit, the plan recommends that all existing bus stops along the Annapolis Road Corridor be retrofitted with bus shelters, benches, trash receptacles and schedule information (Pages 6.56, 6.60, 6.89, and 7.117). The existing bus stop at the northeast corner of property along the Annapolis Road Corridor is lacking these amenities. The bus stop should be improved as noted above per DPW&T and/or The Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) standards. The provision of the bus stop with amenities should satisfy the streetscape elements requirement for the subject application.

i. **Streetscape Construction (Standard 6.k)**

All streetscape improvements shall be completed prior to the issuance of use and occupancy permits for the first building. Construction of streetscape improvements shall not be phased.

Comment: The construction of the sector plan envisioned street section is not currently required; therefore, staff does not believe that a waiver of this standard is required.

The application does propose landscape improvements within the existing right-of-way, as envisioned in the sector plan landscape standards. The landscape plan is phased. Staff believes that the planting proposed along the site's frontage should be implemented prior to the issuance of the first use and occupancy permit for the proposed retail building to provide a comprehensive and immediate improvement to the appearance of the existing shopping center from the public right-of-way.

The long term vision of the site is for a mixed-use residential development. Approval of the subject amendment requests described above for the proposed interim development improves the existing conditions on the site, and does not impede the implementation of the transit district.

j. **Building Design (Standard 3.c)**

The sector plan contains a number of building massing, style and design standards for development within the Mixed-Use Transition Area. The sector plan does not provide exemptions for existing structures that are to remain. The existing commercial shopping center structure and Pizza Hut retail building do not meet these standards, which include specifications for building materials and architectural detailing. Staff recommends that the Planning Board approve an amendment of the building design standards for these existing structures that are to remain.

Staff notes that the proposed retail building meets the building design standards contained in the sector plan.

8. **Zoning Ordinance:** The subject site plan has been reviewed for conformance with the requirements of the M-U-I and D-D-O Zone. The following discussion is offered regarding these requirements.

a. **Requirements of the M-U-I-Zone**

Section 27-546.19. Site Plans for Mixed Uses

(c) **A Detailed Site Plan may not be approved unless the owner shows:**

(1) **The site plan meets all approval requirements in Part 3, Division 9;**

Comment: Section 27-285 of the Zoning Ordinance contains required findings for detailed site plan approval. These required findings are provided under Finding 15 and 16 below.

(2) **All proposed uses meet applicable development standards approved with the Master Plan, Sector Plan, Transit District Development Plan, or other applicable plan;**

Comment: The proposal has been evaluated for conformance with the requirements of the 2010 *Central Annapolis Road Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment*. See Finding 7 for additional discussion.

(3) **Proposed uses on the property will be compatible with one another;**

Comment: The proposed commercial uses on the property are compatible with one another.

(4) **Proposed uses will be compatible with existing or approved future development on adjacent properties and an applicable Transit or Development District; and**

Comment: The proposed uses are compatible with existing development and bring the site into greater conformance with the Development District by implementing improved landscape and architectural standards on the site.

- (5) **Compatibility standards and practices set forth below will be followed, or the owner shows why they should not be applied**
 - (A) **Proposed buildings should be compatible in size, height, and massing to buildings on adjacent properties;**
 - (B) **Primary facades and entries should face adjacent streets or public walkways and be connected by on-site walkways, so pedestrians may avoid crossing parking lots and driveways;**
 - (C) **Site design should minimize glare, light, and other visual intrusions into and impacts on yards, open areas, and building facades on adjacent properties;**
 - (D) **Building materials and color should be similar to materials and color on adjacent properties and in the surrounding neighborhoods, or building design should incorporate scaling, architectural detailing, or similar techniques to enhance compatibility;**
 - (E) **Outdoor storage areas and mechanical equipment should be located and screened to minimize visibility from adjacent properties and public streets;**
 - (F) **Signs should conform to applicable Development District Standards or to those in Part 12, unless the owner shows that its proposed signage program meets goals and objectives in applicable plans; and**
 - (G) **The owner or operator should minimize adverse impacts on adjacent properties and the surrounding neighborhood by appropriate setting of:**
 - (i) **Hours of operation or deliveries;**
 - (ii) **Location of activities with potential adverse impacts;**
 - (iii) **Location and use of trash receptacles;**
 - (iv) **Location of loading and delivery spaces;**
 - (v) **Light intensity and hours of illumination; and**
 - (vi) **Location and use of outdoor vending machines.**

Comment: The application complies with the above standards. The application exceeds the requirements of some standards, and the owner has requested alternate development district standards for others, as required.

b. Development District Overlay Zone Required Findings

Section 27-548.25 Site Plan Approval

- (a) **Prior to issuance of any grading permit for undeveloped property or any building permit in a Development District, a Detailed Site Plan for individual development shall be approved by the Planning Board in accordance with Part 3, Division 9. Site plan submittal requirements for the Development District shall be stated in the Development District Standards. The applicability section of the Development District Standards may exempt from site plan review or limit the review of specific types of development or areas of the Development District.**

Comment: The DSP has been submitted in fulfillment of the above requirement.

- (b) **In approving the Detailed Site Plan, the Planning Board shall find that the site plan meets applicable Development District Standards.**

- (c) **If the applicant so requests, the Planning Board may apply development standards which differ from the Development District Standards, most recently approved or amended by the District Council, unless the Sectional Map Amendment text specifically provides otherwise. The Planning Board shall find that the alternate Development District Standards will benefit the development and the Development District and will not substantially impair implementation of the Master Plan, Master Plan Amendment, or Sector Plan.**

Comment: In response to Section 27-548.25 (b) and (c) of the Zoning Ordinance, the applicant requests that the Planning Board apply development standards which differ from the Development District Standards. Staff believes that the alternate Development District Standards will benefit the Crestview Shopping Center, because if the subject application is approved, the subject commercial site will benefit from significant investment including landscape and public realm improvements, which currently do not exist on the subject site, and have not been historically required. The subject application is a reasonable form of interim development, until a more significant development of the subject site is realized.

The alternate standards will not substantially impair implementation of the 2010 *Central Annapolis Road Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (SMA). The sector plan envisions the future acquisition and razing of the subject shopping center to make way for mixed-use residential development. The infill of the shopping center with an additional pad site, which historically existed, will not impair the long term vision or implementation of the sector plan. Future development proposals on the subject site should be reevaluated for their ability to conform to the sector plan standards.

- (d) **Special Exception procedures shall not apply to uses within a Development District. Uses which would normally require a Special Exception in the underlying zone shall be permitted uses if the Development District Standards so provide, subject to site plan review by the Planning Board. Development District Standards may restrict or prohibit any such uses. The Planning Board shall find in its approval of the site plan that the use complies with all applicable Development District Standards, meets the general Special Exception standards in Section 27-317 (a)(1), (4), (5), and (6), and conforms to the recommendations in the Master Plan, Master Plan Amendment, or Sector Plan.**

Comment: No uses that would typically require special exception are proposed.

- (e) **If a use would normally require a variance or departure, separate application shall not be required, but the Planning Board shall find in its approval of the site plan that the variance or departure conforms to all applicable Development District Standards.**

Comment: No variance or departure is required.

9. **Record Plat WWW 60-84:** The property is known as Parcel D, located on Tax Map 51 in Grid B-3, and is zoned M-U-I. Parcel D was recorded in Plat Book WWW 60-84 on June 22, 1966. The site plan shows the boundary of the property as reflected on the recorded plat and property tax map. The record plat shows a building restriction line along the northwest and southwest property line consistent with the property line, which should be labeled on the site plan. The site plan should also note that all the existing structures are to remain.

10. **2010 Prince George's County Landscape Manual:** The development district standards contained in the 2010 *Central Annapolis Road Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (SMA) modify those contained in the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*. Discussion of the DSP's conformance with the landscape-related development district standards is provided in Finding 7 above.
11. **Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance:** The property is exempt from the Woodland Conservation and Wildlife Habitat Ordinance, because the property contains less than 10,000 square feet of woodland on-site, and has no previous tree conservation plan approvals. A Standard letter of Exemption Number 4551 was issued on May 24, 2011. That exemption remains valid until May 24, 2013.
12. **Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance:** The Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance came into effect on September 1, 2010. The Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance requires a minimum percentage of tree canopy coverage on properties that require a building or grading permit for 1,500 square feet or greater of disturbance or gross floor area (GFA). The subject 7.28-acre parcel is subject to the tree canopy requirement. Properties zoned M-U-I are required to provide a minimum of ten percent of the gross tract area in tree canopy. The application demonstrates conformance with the tree canopy coverage requirements, as follows:

| | REQUIRED | PROPOSED |
|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Tree Canopy | 31,712 sq. ft. | 32,015 sq. ft.* |

* *A phased landscape plan is proposed to meet the Tree Canopy Coverage (TCC) requirements.*

The applicant proposes a phased landscape strategy to meet the Tree Canopy Coverage (TCC) requirements. The existing site is noted to have only 10,890 square feet of existing trees. In order to meet the TCC requirements, 20,822 square feet of additional trees or approximately 93 additional shade trees are required. The applicant asserts that it would be a financial burden to provide the required landscaping for the entire Crestview Square Shopping Center prior to the use and occupancy of the proposed 6,347-square-foot building. The applicant proposed to phase the landscape improvements over a period of at least ten years, with the final phase being the redevelopment of the existing Pizza Hut pad.

Phase 1 includes tree planting around the proposed 6,347-square-foot pad building, along Cooper Lane, adjacent to the Annapolis Road (MD 450) right-of-way, and in the southwest portion of the site. Phase 2 includes some additional landscape improvements along Annapolis Road and interior planting requirements. Phase 3 includes some additional landscape improvements along Annapolis Road and interior planting requirements. Phase 4 is a minor phase that includes the planting of seven trees in a partially vegetative area in the southeastern corner of the site. Phase 5 is the final phase, which includes improvements in the northern portion of the site. This final phase is contingent upon the redevelopment of the existing commercial pad.

Staff recommends revisions to the phased landscape plan. Five phases over a period of at least 10 years appears too drawn out, and too difficult to enforce. Fewer phases with a larger number of improvements proposed in each phase are preferable from an administrative and enforcement perspective. As stated previously in this report, the planting proposed along the site's frontage should be implemented prior to the issuance of the first use and occupancy permit for the proposed retail building to provide a comprehensive and immediate improvement to the appearance of the existing shopping center from the public right-of-way. Improvements to the streetscape are of high importance in the sector plan. Phase 1 should include the trees proposed within and adjacent to the Cooper Lane and Annapolis Road rights-of-way. Staff recommends that the parking lot improvements be completed entirely in Phase 2, with the exception of the

improvements around the Pizza Hut pad, which is acceptable as Phase 3. Phases 1 and 2 should be implemented in a period not to exceed four years. The implementation of Phase 3 should be provided at the time of a redevelopment proposal for the proposed Pizza Hut pad.

The landscape plan should include text that describes the phases and triggers for their implementation. This language has not been provided by the applicant; therefore, staff recommended condition language in the Recommendations Section of this report.

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

- a. **Community Planning North Division**—In a memorandum dated July 5, 2012, the Community Planning North Division provided referral comments on the subject application; as follows:

(1) **2002 Prince George's County Approved General Plan**

The application is consistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies for mixed-use residential areas within the Developed Tier and does not violate the General Plan's growth goals for the year 2025, based upon Prince George's County's current General Plan Growth Policy Update.

(2) **2010 Central Annapolis Road Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment**

The application does not conform to the land use recommendations of the 2010 *Central Annapolis Road Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* for mixed-use residential development at this site.

Two master plan and zoning issues should be considered. The more significant issue is the proposed site plan's setback distances from both the Annapolis Road and Cooper Lane street frontages. The setbacks shown exceed the maximum building placement lines mandated in the approved Central Annapolis Road D-D-O-Z of 80 feet from the mixed-use arterial (Annapolis Road) centerline and five feet from the property line on local mixed-use streets (Cooper Lane). The approved sector plan (page 6.52 of the preliminary sector plan) also calls for construction of a new service road parallel to Annapolis Road at this location.

The applicant site plan shows parking and a drive aisle around the building on both the Annapolis Road (MD 450) and Cooper Lane street frontages. The parking and drive aisle on the Annapolis Road frontage is inconsistent with the sector plan vision of buildings close to the sidewalk and street along Annapolis Road in order to provide a vibrant, safe pedestrian environment.

The second master plan issue involves the proposed use itself; a single-story pad site retail structure. The approved sector plan (page 6.85 of the preliminary sector plan) calls for the long-range redevelopment of this site with mixed-use residential uses that include neighborhood-serving retail. Given the shortage of quality retail uses in the vicinity of the subject site and current market conditions, interim commercial uses of the type proposed may be appropriate for this site.

- b. **The Transportation Planning Section**— In a revised memorandum dated September 17, 2012, the Transportation Planning Section provided comment on the subject detailed site plan. The detailed site plan is a requirement of the D-D-O-Z and also is necessitated by the proposed development in the M-U-I Zone. The review of the detailed site plan focuses on meeting the plan's goals and objectives, and conformance to

the applicable D-D-O-Z standards. In addition to reviewing the plan against the approved plan, attention must be given to the site's access, frontage, parking, and on-site vehicular and pedestrian circulation patterns.

(1) **Sector Plan Vision**

In the short term (2015), the plan recommends road dieting by replacing the existing curb travel lanes in each direction along Annapolis Road between 65th Avenue and Gallatin Street, which includes the section fronting the subject property, with an at-grade bike track separated from the remaining travel lanes by a paint-striped buffer. The bike track would merge onto a bus pullout area or the right-turn lane at the signalized intersections where needed, and re-merge behind the striped buffer beyond these areas (Pages 6.51, 6.60, 7.117, and 7.128).

In the mid-term (2025), the plan recommends reconstruction of wider sidewalks separated from the bike track by landscaped strip including street trees. The bike track, painted buffer, landscape/street tree strip and wider sidewalk on each side of the road would be within the public domain (Pages 6.51, 6.60, 7.117, and 7.128).

In the long-term (2030 and beyond), the plan envisions this portion of Annapolis Road that fronts the subject property as a multi-way boulevard with two travel lanes in each direction separated by a landscaped median with left-turn lanes, bike tracks, plus a service lane with on-street parking on each direction, and wide sidewalks in a 176-foot-wide section. The dedicated rights-of way for the segment between 65th Avenue and Gallatin Street will consist of only the center 90 feet (Pages 6.52, 6.88, 7.116, 8.182 and County Council Resolution CR-100-2010: Amendment 13), but for the segments between Baltimore-Washington Parkway and 65th Avenue and between Gallatin Street and Veterans Parkway, the required Rights-of-way to be dedicated remains as 120 feet. This amends the *2009 Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* (MPOT) recommendation specifying a 120 feet right-of-way dedication for the entire length of the Annapolis Road (A-18) between Veterans Parkway and Baltimore-Washington Parkway.

The plan recommends that the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) fully fund and construct the required corridor-wide short-term and mid-term improvements using applicable public funding sources (Pages 7.117). The plan also identifies and recommends preparation of a corridor-level feasibility study by SHA, and enactment of enabling legislation to implement public use easements as key steps for implementing the recommended long-term transformation and reconstruction of Annapolis Road. The required legislation should include the specifics for the establishment and the collection procedures of a revolving infrastructure improvement fund to help partially fund this reconstruction through developer contributions, on a block-by-block basis, (Pages 6.50, and 7.116).

Among the stated circulation and street network strategies for this area of the plan are the recommendations for the installation of a new four-way intersection at Annapolis Road and 68th Avenue (along the eastern limits of the subject property) and construction of a new secondary residential access lane parallel to and south of Annapolis Road that extends from 68th Place to Cooper Lane, or along the southern limits of the subject property (Pages 6.88, 6.92, 6.94, and 7.123). The submitted plan does not show either of these, because SHA has not initiated the required feasibility analysis as recommended by the plan (Page

(2) **Implementation Mechanisms**

As part of the D-D-O-Z requirements, it is also stated that each developer/property owner, heirs, successors and assignees be required to construct or contribute funds toward the construction and maintenance of all streetscape improvements outside of the dedicated portion of the required rights-of-way which will be maintained by the SHA (Page 8.146, and CR-100-2010: Amendment 72). As of this writing, no legislation has been enacted by the Council to establish the procedure for the financing, construction and maintenance of required streetscape improvements outside of the dedicated portion of the rights-of-way along Annapolis Road.

Transportation Planning staff recommends that prior to issuance of any building permit, provided the enactment of enabling legislation to implement public use easements for implementing the recommended long-term transformation and reconstruction of Annapolis Road and the specifics for the establishment and the collection procedures of a revolving infrastructure improvement fund to help partially fund this reconstruction through developer contributions, The applicant, hires, or assigns should provide the staff with the proof that the required contributions have been made.

Comment: As of the writing of this report, there is no enabling legislation to the effect described above. As there is no enabling legislation, no financial contributions or public use easement have been required for the subject application to implement of the long-term vision of Annapolis Road. Once enabling legislation is enacted, future development applications and/or building permits will be subject, as specified by the contents of that legislation. The effect of future legislation on the subject site area will be evaluated prior to the issuance of building and grading permits. No further action should be required at this time.

(3) **Utility Pole Placement**

Strategy 1.7 of the Action Plan section of the plan, (CR-100-2010: Amendment 48) recommends that as redevelopment occurs, the overhead utilities shall be relocated so as to be compatible with the design of the site and, ideally, located underground. This amendment further states that the leader actor will be developers while the associate actor will be the SHA, DPW&T, and utility companies. The amendment envisions that the timeframe for implementation of this strategy would be long-term. Currently there are several utility poles along the property's frontage with Annapolis Road that are physically located in the sidewalk and are impeding pedestrian movements.

Comment: Utility relocation should be evaluated at the time of a more comprehensive redevelopment of the subject site. The Trails Coordinator has provided specific recommendations to improve pedestrian access along the site's frontage. For additional information see Finding 13.c.

- c. **Trails**—In an memorandum dated July 12, 2012, the Transportation Planning Section provided analysis of the detailed site plan application referenced above for conformance with the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* (MPOT) and the 2006 *Approved Central Annapolis Road Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment*.

(1) *MPOT and 2006 Approved Central Annapolis Road Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment*

There are two master plan trail issues identified in both the MPOT and the area master plan that impact the subject site. Both the MPOT and the area master plan recommend road frontage improvements along Annapolis Road (MD 450), including accommodations for bicyclists and pedestrians. The MPOT includes recommendations for on-road bicycle facilities and standard or wide sidewalks along MD 450. The area master plan further refines these recommendations to include a road diet, more extensive improvements for bicycles and pedestrians, and a “multiway boulevard” concept. The MPOT includes the following recommendation for MD 450:

MD 450 Standard or Wide Sidewalks with On-Road Bicycle Facilities: *Provide continuous sidewalks and on-road bicycle facilities along this heavily traveled corridor. These sidewalks will improve access to the New Carrollton Metro Station, as well as several commercial areas. Areas of high pedestrian traffic may warrant wide sidewalks. Pedestrian amenities and safety features are also warranted in some areas. On-road bicycle facilities should be provided. Although right-of-way constraints may not allow full bicycle lanes, wide outside curb lanes are recommended (MPOT, page 20).*

A standard sidewalk currently exists along the subject site’s frontage of MD 450. Space does not currently exist for designated bike lanes, although narrowing the travel lanes may allow for a wide outside curb lane.

The MPOT also designates Cooper Lane as a master plan bikeway/shared use roadway (see MPOT map). A standard sidewalk currently exists along the site’s frontage of Cooper Lane. Signage is recommended to designate the bikeway and striping for designated bike lanes should be considered by DPW&T at the time of road resurfacing.

The 2010 *Approved Central Annapolis Road Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (SMA) also recommends frontage improvements along MD 450, including a long range vision aimed at a possible “road diet” and enhancement of the overall streetscape for non-motorized uses. More specifically, the area master plan recommends “redesign Annapolis Road as a multiway boulevard” (area master plan, page 6.60). This is further broken down into the following phases:

- In the short term (by 2015), replace the curb lane in each direction between 65th Avenue and Gallatin Street with a bike track and a paint-stripe buffer to separate it from the two remaining travel lanes (area master plan, page 6.60).
- In the long term (2030 and beyond), incorporate bike lanes into the service medians along Annapolis Road (area master plan, page 6.60).

For this long term vision, the subject application is located along the section of Annapolis Road (MD 450) described as the “mixed –use transition area” where MD 450 would be developed as a “mixed use arterial” or “town center arterial”, as depicted in Figure 8.33c of the area master plan. As shown in the proposed cross section included in the master plan (page 8.183), some of the road improvements will be within right-of-way maintained by SHA, while the outside portion of the infrastructure improvements will be outside the public right-of-way and operated by a public-private partnership.

The Complete Streets Section of the MPOT includes the following policies regarding sidewalk construction and the accommodation of pedestrians.

POLICY 1:

Provide standard sidewalks along both sides of all new road construction within the Developed and Developing Tiers.

POLICY 2:

All road frontage improvements and road capital improvement projects within the Developed and Developing Tiers shall be designed to accommodate all modes of transportation. Continuous sidewalks and on-road bicycle facilities should be included to the extent feasible and practical.

Standard sidewalks are reflected along the subject site's frontages of both MD 450 and Cooper Lane, consistent with these policies. Several short sidewalk or crosswalk connections are recommended to better link the proposed retail space with the sidewalks along MD 450 and Cooper Lane, as well as the existing retail shopping center.

(2) Long term Vision for MD 450 Corridor

The current streetscape along both MD 450 and Cooper Lane is minimal, with existing standard sidewalks and no bicycle accommodations. Pedestrians are accommodated along both roads by existing sidewalks in the vicinity of the subject site. Bike lanes will not be feasible along MD 450 until a road diet is implemented by SHA, as envisioned in the area master plan. These short-term facilities (bike lanes and sidewalks) can be accommodated within the existing right-of-way. However, the longer-term "boulevard" concept recommended in the area master plan will require a public/private partnership to maintain a more extensive streetscape with service lanes, buffered bike lanes (or cycle tracks), and wide sidewalks. This type of vision can only be implemented comprehensively for the corridor as large tracts are proposed for redevelopment. It appears that the development of the pad site for the subject application will not preclude or prevent the development of the "ultimate" cross section for the road and the provision of the long term vision in the future.

(3) Utility pole placement

Currently a standard sidewalk exists along MD 450 along the frontage of the subject site. This sidewalk is interrupted in several locations by the placement of a utility pole in the center.

The area master plan includes wording requiring the relocation or undergrounding of utilities as development occurs. Amendment 48 of County Council Resolution CR-10-2010 added the following strategy to the Action Plan:

As redevelopment occurs, overhead utilities shall be relocated so as to be compatible with the design of the site and, ideally, located underground. The lead actor will be developers while the associate actors will be SHA, DPW&T, and utility companies. The implementing timeframe will be long-term, as development occurs.

Currently, it is unclear whether the utility work for the property frontage is most

appropriately done now as part of the pad site development included in the subject application, or when the ultimate, long-term vision for the road is achieved, which will be significantly different than the current cross section. In order to ensure the necessary Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements meet the minimum clearance width along the entire sidewalk on the subject property's frontage of MD 450, the applicant should either relocate the existing utility poles either underground or to a location outside of the sidewalk, consistent with Amendment 48 of County Council Bill CB-10-2010; or construct a sidewalk relocation or "detour" around each of the utility poles on the property frontage, ensuring the minimum clearance width required by current ADA guidelines.

This recommendation is intended to ensure that adequate clear space is provided for pedestrians and ADA users around the utility poles along the frontage of the subject site either by relocating or undergrounding the utilities or by constructed short sidewalk connections around each pole. Current ADA guidance provided from the U.S. Access Board requires that sidewalk widths be at least 60 inches wide, with a minimum passage width for wheelchairs of 32 inches at a point or obstruction (Designing Sidewalks and Trails for Access, page 37). Therefore, the areas around the utility poles should be modified to ensure a minimum clear space of at least 32 inches, with preferably the entire width of the sidewalk being routed around the utility pole.

- d. **The Environmental Planning Section**—In an e-mail dated May 24, 2012, the Environmental Planning Section stated that the site is exempt from the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance because it contains less than 10,000 square feet of woodland and has no previous TCP approvals. A Natural Resource Inventory (NRI) has been provided in the form of a letter.
- e. **The Subdivision Review Section**—In a memorandum dated June 19, 2012, the Subdivision Review Section provided comment on the subject detailed site plan. Section 24-111 of the Subdivision Regulations provides for exemptions from the requirement of filing a preliminary plan of subdivision for parcels with a record plat. Specifically, in this instance, the site is subject to Section 24-111(c)(4) which provides:

(c) **A final plat of subdivision approved prior to October 27, 1970, shall be resubdivided prior to the issuance of a building permit unless:**

- (4) **The development of more than five thousand (5,000) square feet of gross floor area, which constitutes at least ten percent (10%) of the total area of the site, has been constructed pursuant to a building permit issued on or before December 31, 1991.**

Parcel D is the subject of a record plat approved in 1966. The total property land area is 314,503 square feet and the existing development of gross floor area on the property is 70,171 square feet (22.31 percent of the total land area). Based on the 1984 aerial photography, the shopping center was constructed before 1991. Therefore, the site is exempt from the requirement of filing a preliminary plan of subdivision pursuant to Section 24-111(c)(4) of the Subdivision Regulations for Parcel D based on the existing conditions of the site.

- f. **The Permit Review Section**—In an updated memorandum dated July 2, 2012, the Permit Review Section provided comment on the subject detailed site plan. The Permit Review Section staff comments have been addressed through plan revisions or

recommended conditions of approval.

Comment: Some additional information is needed. It is not clear that parking spaces provided on the Crestview Shopping Center site meet the County standards. The dimensions of parking spaces should be labeled across the site, and if compact spaces are provided, they should be labeled on the site plan. Additionally, a table should be provided indicating the number of compact and regular spaces. If the plan is unable to conform to the appropriate County standards, then restriping in accordance with the County standards should be indicated.

g. **The Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T)**—In a memorandum dated June 4, 2012, DPW&T offered the following comments:

- (1) The property is located on the eastern corner of the intersection of Annapolis Road (MD-450) and Cooper Lane. Cooper Lane is a county-maintained roadway. Frontage improvements are required in accordance with DPW&T's standards for Cooper Lane. The existing site entrance on Cooper Lane does not meet the current DPW&T standards. The entrance requires widening in accordance with DPW&T's commercial and driveway entrance standards.
- (2) Conformance with DPW&T's street tree and street lighting standards is required.

Comment: A number of street trees are missing along the site's frontage on Cooper Lane. These required trees should be provided on the plan to indicate conformance with the requirements of the 2010 *Central Annapolis Road Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment*;

- (3) The site plan does not have an approved stormwater concept.

Comment: In response to the DPW&T referral, the applicant has since provided an approved stormwater management concept plan and letter for review. Stormwater Concept Plan 5656-2012-00 remains valid until May 25, 2015.

- h. **Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA)**—In a memorandum submitted on July 2, 2012, SHA indicated that they had no objection to the subject application.
- i. **Prince George's County Police Department**—At the Subdivision and Development Review Committee (SDRC) Meeting on June 8, 2012, the Prince George's County Police Department provided no comment on the subject application. The detailed site plan includes a tenant space within the proposed building that is indicated to become a Police Substation. Staff understands that this is to replace a police trailer that currently exists in the parking lot of the shopping center. The site plan should be revised to locate the existing trailer and note that the substation is to be relocated into the proposed tenant space prior to signature approval of the plans.
- j. **Prince George's County Health Department**—In a memorandum dated June 8, 2012, the Environmental Engineering Program of the Prince George's County Health Department provided a health impact assessment for the subject site. The referral discussed the prevalence of diabetes and obesity in areas with a prevalence of carry-out stores and convenience stores.
- k. **Fire/EMS Department**—In a memorandum dated June 5, 2012, the Fire/EMS Department provided a standard response on the subject application.

1. **Landover Hills**—Referral comment from Landover Hills was not provided prior to the publishing of the subject technical staff report.
15. Based on the foregoing and as required by Section 27-285(b)(1), 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. While the subject site plan proposes a new building of only 6,347 square feet, improvements and substantial new landscaping on the overall 7.28-acre site with an existing 70,171 square feet of development are technically required by the sector plan and the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance. The subject detailed site plan includes a phased landscape plan, which will allow the site to meet the landscape standards contained in the Sector Plan, as amended, and the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance over a more extended period, without requiring unreasonable cost to the applicant all at one time, because the costs may be spread over three distinct phases.
16. Section 27-285(b)(4) requires that regulated environmental features be preserved and/or restored in a natural state to the fullest extent possible. As there are no regulated environmental features on the subject site, this required finding does not apply.

RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the foregoing evaluation and analysis, the Urban Design staff recommends the following:

- A. Staff recommends APPROVAL of the alternative development district standards for:
 1. **Standard 3.a:** To allow for increased building setbacks from Annapolis Road (MD 450) and Cooper Lane.
 2. **Standard 3.b(1):** To allow existing parking areas to remain in the front yard and corner side yard.
 3. **Standard 3.b(2):** To allow large existing parking fields to remain.
 4. **Standard 3.b(5):** To allow existing parking spaces to remain in excess of the maximum permitted.
 5. **Standard 3.c.:** To amend the building design standards to permit the existing shopping center and Pizza Hut building to remain in their current form.
 6. **Standard 6.c:** To allow a reduction in the street tree requirement along Annapolis Road where there is lack of planting area.
 7. **Standard 6.d:** To allow existing parking spaces to remain in excess of the maximum permitted.
 8. **Standard 6.g:** To modify the buffering incompatible uses requirements and allow some existing parking and building encroachments to remain in the required 4.7 bufferyard along the southeast property line.

The site shall be reevaluated for its ability to conform to development district standards more fully with each future redevelopment proposal. Approval of the above amendments for the subject

proposal shall not be construed as a waiver from the development district standards for future development on the subject site.

B. Staff recommends DISAPPROVAL of the alternative development district standards for:

1. **Standard 6.e:** The application should screen the existing dumpster and loading areas from adjacent residential development.
2. **Standard 6.h:** The application should include streetscape elements that can be provided at this time, such as a bus shelter along Annapolis Road, as conditioned below.

C. Staff recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and APPROVE Detailed Site Plan DSP-12005, Crestview Square Shopping Center, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, the plans shall be revised as follows:
 - a. The architectural elevations for the proposed retail building shall be revised to indicate a consistent and attractive cornice or parapet treatment.
 - b. The architectural elevations shall be revised to dimension the proposed building-mounted signage areas.
 - c. A low brick or brick-faced wall shall be provided on the subject site to screen the parking proposed between the new retail building and the Annapolis Road and Cooper Lane rights-of-way. A detail of an attractive low brick or brick-faced wall compatible with the proposed retail building architecture shall be provided.

Alternatively, the applicant shall remove the parking and vehicular access between the proposed building and the rights-of-way.
 - d. The proposed loading space shall be relocated out of the drive aisle proximate to the site's Cooper Lane entrance to an area less visible from the right-of-way; or it shall be eliminated from the proposal. The quantity of provided loading spaces should be correct on the approved site plan.
 - e. Provide one striped crosswalk with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) curb cuts and ramps between the proposed retail space and the existing shopping center.
 - f. Provide one sidewalk and crosswalk connection from the existing sidewalk along Cooper Lane to the sidewalk around the proposed retail space.
 - g. Provide one sidewalk connection from the existing sidewalks and curb cuts at the intersection of Annapolis Road (MD 450) and Cooper Lane to the parking lot at the proposed retail space, unless modified by the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA).
 - h. The dimensions of parking spaces shall be labeled across the site, and if compact spaces are provided, they shall be labeled on the site plan. Additionally, a table shall be provided indicating the number of compact and regular spaces.

- i. Indicate the location of the existing police trailer and provide a plan note that states that the trailer is to be removed and the police substation is to be relocated in the proposed tenant space.
 - j. The site entrance along Cooper Lane shall be indicated for widening in accordance with DPW&T's commercial and driveway entrance standards, unless additional information is provided that DPW&T wishes to modify this request.
 - k. The site plan shall indicate the use of the following features and provide details for them: decorative concrete paving around the building pad, planters with seating walls, and crosswalks utilizing colored asphalt paving.
 - l. A detail for durable, non-wood trash enclosure shall be provided for the proposed dumpster. The enclosure shall include masonry materials complementary to the proposed building.
2. The landscape plan shall be revised as follows:
 - a. The landscape plan shall indicate the location of the existing concrete pad along Annapolis Road, and specify if it is to be removed. Proposed trees shall be relocated or removed as necessary.
 - b. Additional low shrubs shall be evenly provided adjacent to the entire Cooper Lane and Annapolis Road rights-of-way in accordance with the sector plan standard 6.d, as site conditions permit.
 - c. Seven additional interior planting islands with a minimum area of 320 square feet shall be provided within the existing parking lot for 14 additional shade trees.
 - d. The plan shall demonstrate screening of dumpsters and loading from adjacent residential properties through proposed landscaping and opaque fencing at the southeast property line. The additional screening treatment shall be provided between the existing parking lot and the adjacent property line. Details that indicate the use of a durable, natural-color, non-wood fence should be provided.
 - e. The standard 6.g schedule shall be revised to indicate the area within the required buffer that is occupied by existing woodland.
 3. Prior to the issuance of the first building permit for the subject retail building, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide a financial contribution of \$210 to the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) for the placement of Class III bikeway signage on Cooper Lane.
 4. Prior to the issuance of the first use and occupancy permit for the subject retail building, the applicant, the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assigns shall do one of the following:
 - a. Relocate the existing utility poles either underground or to a location outside of the sidewalk, consistent with Amendment 48 of County Council Bill CB-10-2010; or
 - b. Construct a sidewalk relocation or "detour" around each of the utility poles on the property frontage, ensuring the minimum clearance width required by current Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) guidelines.

5. Striping for designated bike lanes (or other appropriate pavement markings) along Cooper Lane should be considered by DPW&T at the time of road resurfacing or maintenance.
6. The landscape improvements shall be implemented in the following phases:
 - a. Prior to the issuance of the first use and occupancy permit for the subject retail building, Phase 1 landscape improvements shall be implemented. Phase 1 landscape improvements shall include tree planting around the proposed 6,347-square-foot pad building, along the site's entire frontage on Cooper Lane, along the entirety of the site's frontage on the Annapolis Road right-of-way, and in the southwest portion of the site.
 - b. Within three years of the issuance of the final use and occupancy permit for the retail building, the Phase 2 landscape improvements shall be implemented, which shall include all of the parking lot improvements, with the exception of the improvements around the Pizza Hut pad site.
 - c. The implementation of Phase 3 landscape improvements shall be provided at the time of a redevelopment proposal for the proposed Pizza Hut pad.
7. Prior to issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall fully fund and agree to the provision of bus shelter, bench, trash receptacle and schedule information per DPW&T and/or WMATA standards for the existing bus stop at the northeast corner of the property along Annapolis Road (MD 450).