



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

Detailed Site Plan Alternative Compliance

DSP-91071-02
AC-92064-01

Application	General Data	
Project Name: First Baptist Church of Highland Park Location: Southeast side of Sheriff Road, approximately 214 feet east of its intersection with Martin Luther King Jr. Highway (MD 704). Applicant/Address: First Baptist Church of Highland Park 6801 Sheriff Road Landover, MD 20785	Planning Board Hearing Date:	07/28/11
	Staff Report Date:	07/18/11
	Date Accepted:	05/10/11
	Planning Board Action Limit:	Waived
	Plan Acreage:	18.12
	Zone:	R-80
	Dwelling Units:	N/A
	Gross Floor Area:	128,112 sq. ft.
	Planning Area:	72
	Tier:	Developed
	Council District:	05
	Election District	13
	Municipality:	N/A
	200-Scale Base Map:	202NE06

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates	
Building additions of 81,896 square feet to an existing 46,216-square-foot church, school and daycare building complex with additional parking to serve a church with 1,199 seats. Variance request from Section 27-442(f) for building height. Variance to Section 25-122(b)(1)(G) for removal of a specimen tree.	Informational Mailing:	07/01/10
	Acceptance Mailing:	05/09/11
	Sign Posting Deadline:	06/28/11

Staff Recommendation		Staff Reviewer: Jill Kosack Phone Number: 301-952-4689 E-mail: jill.kosack@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-91071-02
Alternative Compliance AC-92064-01
Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan TCP2-129-91-02
First Baptist Church of Highland Park

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 revision to a detailed site plan (DSP) was reviewed and evaluated for compliance with the following criteria:

- a. The requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, specifically,
 - Section 27-441, Uses Permitted in Residential Zones;
 - Section 27-442, Regulations for Development in Residential Zones; and
 - Section 27-429, R-80 Zone (One-Family Detached Residential).
- b. The requirements of Section 27-230 of the Zoning Ordinance regarding criteria for granting variances.
- c. The requirements of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-98052.
- d. The requirements of Detailed Site Plan 91071 and its revision.
- e. The requirements of the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*.
- f. The requirements of the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance and the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance.
- g. Referral comments.

FINDINGS

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

1. **Request:** The subject application is for approval of 81,896-square-foot additions to an existing 46,216-square-foot church, school and daycare building complex with additional parking to serve a church with 1,199 seats. The companion variance requests a departure from Section 27-442(f) of the Zoning Ordinance to allow a maximum building height of 59 feet, instead of 40 feet. The companion application, Departure from Sign Design Standards DSDS-668, requests a departure from Section 27-617(a) of the Zoning Ordinance to allow for a departure to the maximum allowed area and height of the free-standing sign.

2. **Development Data Summary:**

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone	R-80	R-80
Total Site Area	18.12 acres	18.06 acres
Parcels/Lots	Parcel C; Lots 17, 18, 21 and 22; Part of vacated Hunt Ave. and Park Ave.	Parcel D; 0.06 Acres Dedicated to Sheriff Road
Uses	800-seat church, 117-children day care, 250-student private school, credit union building	1,199-seat church, 117-children day care, 250-student private school, gymnasium
Total Building Gross Floor Area	46,216 sq. ft.	128,112 sq. ft.
Gross Floor Area Breakdown		
Wyatt Annex	2,485 sq. ft.	2,485 sq. ft.
Education Building	30,466 sq. ft.	30,466 sq. ft.
Sanctuary	12,303 sq. ft.	66,631 sq. ft.
Ancillary Ministry	962 sq. ft.	0 sq. ft.
Gymnasium	0 sq. ft.	28,530 sq. ft.
Lot Coverage (60% maximum)	28.7% (5.21 acres)	38.5% (6.96 acres)

Other Development Data:

Parking Required	357 spaces
Church – 1,199 seats @ 1 space per 4 seats	300 spaces
Daycare Center – 117 Children @ 1 space per 8 children	15 spaces
Private School – 250 students @ 1 space per 6 students	42 spaces

Parking Provided	496 spaces
Standard Spaces	473 spaces
Compact Spaces	2 spaces
ADA Spaces	17 spaces
Van Accessible ADA Spaces	4 spaces

Loading Spaces Required	2 spaces
Loading Spaces Provided	2 spaces

Play Area Required for Daycare	4,388 square feet
117 children x 0.5 x 75 square feet	
Play Area Provided for Daycare	4,800 square feet

Play Area Required for Private School	25,000 square feet
250 students x 100 square feet	
Play Area Provided for Daycare	25,144 square feet

3. **Location:** The subject property is located at 6801 Sheriff Road in Landover. The property is located on the southeast side of Sheriff Road, approximately 214 feet east of its intersection with Martin Luther King Jr. Highway (MD 704).
4. **Surrounding Uses:** The subject site is irregular and jagged in shape and is surrounded by the right-of-way for Sheriff Road to the north, and across it by R-T-zoned property developed with townhomes, part of the Palmerwood subdivision; M-U-I-zoned lots developed with a fast food restaurant, a Kentucky Fried Chicken, to the northwest; M-U-I-zoned lots developed with a gas station and a telecommunications pole to the west; R-80-zoned property developed as the National Harmony Memorial Park public cemetery to the south and east; R-80-zoned properties developed with single-family detached dwellings to the east; and a R-80-zoned parcel developed with an animal shelter that is notched into the northeastern corner of the site along Sheriff Road.
5. **Previous Approvals:** The existing church on-site was originally developed in the 1950s and 1960s. The subject site has a previously approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, 4-92017, which was approved for one parcel and two outlots on April 23, 1992. Subsequently, on September 10, 1992 the Planning Board approved the original DSP-91071 (PGCPB Resolution No. 92-247) for an 800-seat church and a 100-student day care, subject to one condition. On December 3, 1998, the Planning Board approved a new Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, 4-98052, (PGCPB Resolution No. 98-310) for one outlot and one parcel on the subject site, subject to five conditions. On June 19, 2003, the Planning Board approved DSP-91071-01 (PGCPB Resolution No. 03-139), subject to three conditions, for a revision to the site plan to allow a private school for 250 students, to add 17 children to the existing daycare center and to add a

1,064-square-foot credit union building as an accessory use. On October 22, 2009, a Vacation Petition, V-09005, was approved by the Planning Board to allow the vacation of part of Hunt Avenue and part of Park Avenue, with the reversion of ownership to the First Baptist Church of Highland Park. The 2010 *Approved Subregion 4 Master Plan and Adopted Sectional Map Amendment* rezoned the C-M zoned portion of the subject property to the R-80 Zone and retained the R-80 Zone for the remainder of the property. The site also has an approved Stormwater Management Concept #16624-2009, which was approved on February 14, 2011.

6. **Design Features:** The subject property has an irregular, jagged, linear shape that runs for approximately 1,700 feet along the southeast side of Sheriff Road, just east, and uphill, from its intersection with Martin Luther King Jr. Highway. The site has many steep slopes that range from high elevations in the southeast, to a midpoint in the front of the site along Sheriff Road, to low elevations around the environmental features in the southwest. The property has been developed and expanded at various times over the years to include a 12, 303-square-foot, 30-foot-high, 800-seat brick sanctuary with a 2,485-square-foot, 30-foot-high annex located in the north central portion of the site, within approximately 30 feet of the right-of-way for Sheriff Road. Most recently, the 30, 466-square-foot, two-story, 40-foot-high, brick school and day care building was added just southwest of the existing sanctuary building. The site has three existing access driveways off of Sheriff Road, one west of the sanctuary, one near the northeast corner of the sanctuary and one further east. Various parking lots surround the buildings in the central portion of the site. The existing, chain-link-fence-enclosed day care play area is located immediately to the east of the school building and the play area for the school is located at the east end of the site, past a 962-square-foot building used for ancillary church uses.

The proposed development is to be completed in two phases. The first phase includes the construction of the 66,631-square-foot, 1,199-seat, two-story, 59-foot-high sanctuary building to the east of the existing sanctuary building, new parking lots to the southeast and west and reconfigured parking lots to the east and south, the removal of the ancillary church use building, an improved, six-foot-high, black-vinyl-coated chain link fence enclosed outdoor play area for the school at the west end of the site, landscaping and lighting. The second phase includes only the demolition of the existing sanctuary building and the construction of the 28,530-square-foot, 38-foot-high, gymnasium building in its stead. The two access drives at the east end of the site will be moved further to the east to accommodate the new sanctuary building and parking areas. The far eastern and southern parts of the site will remain undeveloped with existing woodlands.

The proposed sanctuary will be a large, contemporary style building with a mostly flat roof and will be finished in multi-styled bands of brick and exterior insulation finishing system (EIFS) in various shades of red and off-white. The main entrance will face onto the parking area to the east end of the site and will consist of a large, central, pointed wall of windows, including stained glass. The building will also have multiple other entrances on the north, south and west sides to allow full access. The northern elevation of the building, facing Sheriff Road, will include one building entrance, multiple large, aluminum-framed windows, including three, evenly-spaced, pointed window walls, and a portion of black, asphalt-shingled, hipped roof. The south and west elevations of the building, which face the parking lots and proposed gymnasium respectively, will continue the same façade materials, but include only a few windows and doors.

The proposed second phase gymnasium will continue much of the same styling and materials as the proposed sanctuary building, including the flat roof, multi-styled bands of brick and EIFS in various shades of red and off-white, and the large, pointed features done either with a wall of windows or defined with bricks and EIFS. The main entrance will be on the north side, facing Sheriff Road, but it will also be connected internally to the school and proposed sanctuary. For

both the proposed gymnasium and the proposed sanctuary, no plantings have been provided immediately around the building, specifically on the north and east sides, where some decorative-type plantings, including ornamental trees, shrubs, perennials and annuals, would help to mitigate the scale of the building and provide a friendlier pedestrian environment on the adjacent sidewalks. Therefore, a condition has been included in the Recommendation Section of this report requiring the addition of decorative plantings in these areas to the DSP.

The only new signage proposed with this DSP is a 16.92-foot-tall, 150.84-square-foot, freestanding aluminum, red, tan and off-white sign with an inset digital message screen. There are multiple, proposed, tall retaining walls throughout the site to accommodate the steep grade. These will be constructed from a tan modular block and are mostly located near the rear of the site away from highly visible areas.

Loading spaces and trash dumpsters are provided at the rear of the gymnasium and school buildings. Stormwater management will be accommodated in existing and proposed underground facilities throughout the site and a small above-ground pond at the far western end of the site.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **Zoning Ordinance:** The subject detailed site plan is in compliance with Section 27-441, Uses Permitted in Residential Zones, and Section 27-429, R-80 Zone (One-Family Detached Residential) of the Zoning Ordinance. Churches are a permitted use on lots that are larger than two acres in size. The site plan is also in conformance with the requirements of Section 27-445.03 regarding day care centers in residential zones and the requirements of Section 27-443 regarding private schools in residential zones.
 - a. The proposal is in conformance with the requirements of Section 27-442 regarding regulations in the R-80 Zone, except for Section 27-442(f), which restricts all allowed uses to a maximum building height of 40 feet. The applicant has submitted an application for a variance from Section 27-442(f) to allow the proposed church sanctuary to be 59 feet high.

Section 27-230(a) of the Zoning Ordinance sets forth the following required findings for approval of a variance:

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

Applicant's Justification: The applicant provided the following summarized justification in response to this requirement:

“The subject property has a very irregular, jagged-shape, similar to that of a saw blade, and has nearly 1,700 feet of frontage along Sheriff Road. The site narrows on both ends to a depth of approximately 335 feet in the northeastern portion and approximately 220 feet in the southwest. The new sanctuary and gymnasium buildings are located in the most level and widest central portion of the site where disturbance and grading can be minimized. Exceptional topographic conditions elsewhere on the site, coupled with existing development, the grade of parking lots, and the presence of tree conservation areas, create substantial

constraints in locating the proposed buildings. Because of the constrained development envelope created by topographic conditions and property shape, and the desire to keep the new sanctuary adjacent to the existing buildings, the new facilities must be designed more compactly with a vertical orientation.

“The applicant also notes that Section 27-442(f) Footnote 7 allows for the height of public and quasi-public buildings to be increased to 120 feet, provided that, for each one foot increase in height, every yard is increased by one foot. A church, as an institutional use does not qualify for this allowance; however, the proposed new sanctuary does meet this ratio by increasing all provided yards by more than 19 feet, in relation to the requested height variance.”

Comment: Staff concurs with the applicant’s assertion that the environmental areas, irregular lot shape, existing development, and exceptional topography, with a 110-foot elevation difference across the site, are unique constraints on the subject property. They contribute to a condition that limits the area available for siting the new building and makes a vertical orientation more accommodating for the desired development. Additionally, the increased yard widths provided in accordance with the allowed ratio for other uses create a unique situation, such that if the definition of the use were slightly different, the 59-foot height would be allowed without a variance.

An approval of a height variance in this case would reduce the need to impact sensitive environmental areas and allow for the retention of a significant area of existing woodlands.

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

Applicant’s Justification: The applicant provided the following summarized justification in response to this requirement:

“Not allowing the height variance for the new sanctuary will create peculiar and unusual practical difficulties for the applicant. Without the building height variance, the ability of the property to accommodate a new sanctuary and gymnasium, designed to meet the specific growth needs of the church, is limited. There simply is no practical way to both accommodate the growth needs of the church and minimize site disturbance, without allowing a three-story sanctuary facility to accommodate the 1,199 seat congregation and supporting facilities. The only available and practical development option for providing sufficient sanctuary and gymnasium space is to build vertically. The strict application of a 40-foot height limit would require a two-story facility that consumes more land area, disturbs more of the site’s environmental features, and does not meet the vision of the church for the design of a new sanctuary that can be integrated with the existing buildings.”

Comment: Staff concurs with the applicant’s assertion that the strict application of the maximum height limit would result in a practical difficulty of making it nearly impossible to site a new sanctuary of sufficient size to accommodate the congregation, on this uniquely-shaped, steep, property.

- (3) **The variance will not substantially impair the intent, purpose, or integrity of the General Plan or Master Plan.**

Applicant's Justification: The applicant provided the following summarized justification in response to this requirement:

“Allowing the 19-foot height variance will not impair the intent, purpose of integrity of the 2002 General Plan or the 2010 Subregion 4 Master Plan. In fact, the variance will allow development to occur that is supportive of General Plan and master plan goals and recommendations for properties in the Developed Tier, like this one. Some of these include, among others, strengthening existing neighborhoods, encouraging appropriate infill, and preserving sensitive features. The requested variance will allow the applicant to fulfill a growing need to provide an integrated Christian campus complex for spiritual, social, cultural and recreational activities. The new sanctuary and gymnasium will accommodate a growing demand for space and will thereby assist in strengthening a sense of community fellowship by serving more people. Additionally, Developed Tier Policy 1 encourages flexibility in applying zoning requirements so as to remove obstacles to quality infill and redevelopment as represented by the outstanding design and environmental compatibility of the proposed development. The applicant believes the existing church and its proposed expansion, including a new gymnasium, will help strengthen the community by creating a new institutional identity and creating a gateway into the Sheriff Road corridor.”

Comment: Staff concurs with the applicant's assertion that the variance will not impair the intent, purpose, or integrity of the 2002 *Prince George's County Approved General Plan* or the 2010 Approved Subregion 4 Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment.

- b. The proposal was reviewed for conformance to the requirements of Section 27-617 regarding institutional signage as follows:

Sec. 27-617. Institutional - Other than Temporary.

- (a) **In any zone (except Comprehensive Design and Mixed Use Zones) where a church; library; school; hospital; fire station; community center; day care center for children; service, fraternal, or civic organizations; or other similar institution is allowed, a sign may be erected. Institutional signs shall meet the following design standards:**
- (1) **Maximum area for each sign - 48 square feet.**
 - (2) **Maximum height - 8 feet above finished grade at base of sign.**
 - (3) **Minimum setback - 15 feet from adjoining land in any Residential Zone (or land proposed to be used for residential purposes in a Comprehensive Design, Mixed Use, or Planned Community Zone).**
 - (4) **Type allowed - freestanding or attached to a building.**
 - (5) **Maximum number - 1 per street the property fronts on (must face street frontage).**

Comment: The applicant is proposing the installation of a 150.84-square-foot, 16.92-foot-high freestanding sign for identification of the church. This requires departures of 102.84 square feet from subsection (1), to permit a sign larger than the allowed 48 square feet, and a departure of 8.92 feet from subsection (2), to permit a sign taller than the allowed eight feet. A detailed discussion of the departure request is provided in the analysis of the companion Departure from Sign Design Standards, DSDS-668.

Additionally, on a site visit, staff noted a second freestanding sign, advertising the private school, located near the existing western driveway entrance. The site is only allowed one permanent freestanding sign, so this additional sign should be labeled as to be removed and a condition requiring such has been included in this staff report.

8. **Conformance to Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-98052:** The Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-98052 was approved on December 3, 1998 by the Planning Board, subject to five conditions, and a final plat of subdivision for the property was recorded in the Prince George's County Land Records on September 12, 2003 and is evidenced in Plat Book REP 197@70. The following conditions of the preliminary plan of subdivision approval are applicable to the review of this DSP:

1. **The applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assigns shall dedicate, as necessary, 40 feet from the center line of Sheriff Road for future roadway improvements.**

Comment: The submitted DSP shows an existing and proposed right-of-way line 40 feet from the centerline along its frontage of Sheriff Road.

3. **The final plat shall reflect a 10-foot wide trail easement on dry ground along the Cabin Branch. The location of the easement shall be approved by the Transportation Planning Division.**

Comment: In a memorandum dated June 8, 2011, the trails planner provided the following analysis of this condition:

This condition was placed in order to implement a trail proposal included in the 1993 *Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Landover and Vicinity*. This proposed trail followed a tributary of Cabin Branch, but was not designated as a park trail corridor. The easement was necessary to provide public access along a privately maintained corridor. However, the more recent 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* (CMPOT) eliminated this recommendation (and many others like it) in order to avoid placing public trails on private property or privately owned HOA land. Due to the concerns about placing public use easements in certain private property environments and the elimination of the master plan trail proposal in this location, no trail or trail easement is recommended along the tributary of Cabin Branch for the subject application.

9. **Conformance to Detailed Site Plans DSP-91071 and DSP-91071-01:**

- a. **Detailed Site Plan DSP-91071:** The Planning Board approved DSP-91071 on September 10, 1992 with one condition, which warrants the following discussion:

1. **Prior to certificate approval, the plan shall be revised to address the**

following comments of the Permit Review Section:

a. The church must provide its tax exempt identification number.

Comment: The submitted DSP does not include the church's tax exempt identification number and should be revised to include it. Therefore, a condition has been included in the Recommendation section of this report requiring this addition to the DSP.

b. Lot coverage calculations must be provided.

Comment: The submitted DSP provides the total lot coverage, but does not provide the calculations. Therefore, a condition has been included in the Recommendation section of this report requiring the addition of a breakdown of the proposed lot coverage to the DSP.

c. The maximum building height is 40 feet. The plan indicates the proposed education building will be 41 feet in height. Change to the height as required by the Zoning Ordinance

Comment: The submitted DSP indicates that the existing education building is 40 feet high and a variance has been requested for the 59-foot-high proposed sanctuary building.

d. The calculations for the play area requirement must be provided in the notes.

Comment: The submitted DSP provides the calculations for the outdoor play area for the daycare and private school; however, the play area provided for the school as listed on the cover sheet does not match that on the plan sheet. Therefore, a condition has been included in the Recommendation section of this report requiring the correction of this discrepancy.

e. Parking for a day care center is 1 space required for every 8 children. One space for four seats (800 seats) is required for the church. Therefore, 212.5 or 213 parking spaces are required for both uses. This note must be corrected.

Comment: The submitted DSP provides parking for each of the site's proposed and existing uses at the required ratios.

f. A minimum of 22 feet of access must be provided to all parking areas in order to accommodate two-way traffic. The drive aisle adjacent to the existing Sunday school must be designated as one way.

Comment: The submitted DSP provides sufficient driveway widths and the one-way drive aisle has been designated as such.

g. Parking spaces cannot be used for any other purposes. One 12 foot by 33 foot separate loading space must be provided (parking spaces

cannot double as a loading area).

Comment: The submitted DSP proposes two separate 12-foot by 33-foot loading-only spaces.

- h. Parking must be provided and the use included in the parking schedule of the existing Sunday school building or add a note to indicate that the building is to be torn down when the new Sunday school building is completed.**

Comment: The submitted DSP provides parking for each of the site's proposed and existing uses at the required ratios.

- i. The landscape plan does not match the site plan. The plans must show the same information.**

Comment: The submitted DSP and landscape plan show the same information.

- j. The dumpster and transformer pad shown behind the church conflicts with the parking layout shown on the landscape plan. The plans must show the same information.**

Comment: The submitted DSP and landscape plan show the same information.

- k. Outdoor play area operation must be limited. This note must be added onto the site plan.**

Comment: The submitted DSP does not provide a note regarding the operation times of the outdoor play areas. Therefore, a condition has been included in the Recommendation Section of this report requiring this addition to the DSP.

- l. There are 335 parking spaces on the site plan. The site notes indicate that a total of 342 spaces are provided. The correct total should be indicated.**

Comment: The submitted DSP provides a total of 496 parking spaces.

- m. Labeling the proposed building as "Education Building" gives the impression that this may be used as a private school. The word education should be replaced with "day care/Sunday School" building (for purposes of clarity).**

Comment: The submitted DSP labels the school building as such.

- n. The mix of evergreens shown on the Detailed Site Plan in the buffer area shall be changed to a 1/3-2/3 mix of evergreens to add variety. A more appropriate variety of evergreen should be submitted for the red cedars that are shown.**

Comment: The submitted DSP provides buffers where needed with a mix of plant types and species.

- o. The size of the plants should be revised to meet the minimum standards required by the Landscape Manual.**

Comment: The submitted DSP proposes all plants at the minimum standard size required by the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*.

- p. Trees and shrubbery should be added to the play area for the day care to provide separation from the parking lot and to add shade.**

Comment: The submitted landscape certification form indicates that the previously proposed shrubs between the day care play area and parking lot are missing and are to be replaced. To ensure this happens, a condition has been included in the Recommendation section of this report requiring the DSP to show all of the previously approved landscaping that needs to be removed and replaced or replanted.

- b. Detailed Site Plan DSP-91071-01:** The Planning Board approved DSP-91071-01 on June 19, 2003, PGCPB Resolution No. 92-247, subject to three conditions, which warrant the following discussion:

- 2. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, either a plat of correction to remove Note 3 shall be approved, or a new preliminary plan of subdivision shall be approved.**

Comment: A plat of correction to remove Note 3 as discussed was approved and recorded as the current record plat for the property, REP 197-70.

- 3. Prior to certification, the following revisions shall be made:**

- a. The bufferyard along Lot 16, Huntsville shall be revised to be a "B" bufferyard.**

Comment: The submitted DSP shows the bufferyard along Lot 16 as a Type "B" bufferyard as required.

- b. Details for a proposed brick dumpster enclosure shall be provided.**

Comment: The submitted DSP provided a detail for a dumpster enclosure for the new dumpster location; however, it did not indicate the material of the enclosure. Therefore, a condition has been included in this approval requiring this to be shown as a brick enclosure.

- c. The use of Arborvitae as a shrub shall be changed to Glossy Abelia or other acceptable shrub.**

Comment: The submitted DSP does not use arborvitae as a shrub.

- 10. Prince George's County Landscape Manual:** Landscaping, screening, and buffering of development in the R-80 Zone should be provided as set forth in the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*. The site plan is subject to Section 4.2, Requirements for Landscape

Strips Along Streets; Section 4.3, Parking Lot Requirements; Section 4.4, Screening Requirements; Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses; and Section 4.9, Sustainable Landscaping Requirements of the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*.

- a. The subject site is bordered by two public rights-of-way, Sheriff Road and Hunt Avenue, which is a small, platted, undeveloped right-of-way that the applicant intends to have vacated in the future. However, for now, a Section 4.2, Landscape Strip Along Streets, is required along both of these frontages. The landscape plan provides the appropriate schedules for both rights-of-way; however, some of them are completed incorrectly or do not correspond to what is labeled and shown on the landscape plan itself. These schedules and the landscape plan, specifically for Landscape Strips 4, 5, 6, 8, and 13, should be revised to be complete and correct. A condition requiring this has been included in the Recommendation Section of this report.

Additionally, the applicant has requested alternative compliance to Section 4.2 for portions of the frontage along Sheriff Road and Hunt Avenue. The findings of the Alternative Compliance Committee are as follows:

REQUEST 1: Section 4.2 Landscape Strips along Streets, along Sheriff Road.

REQUIRED: 4.2 Landscape Strips along Streets, along Sheriff Road, Plant Schedule 3

Length of Landscaped Strips	±440 feet
Width of Landscaped Strips	10 feet
Shade Trees	13
Shrubs	126

PROVIDED: 4.2 Landscape Strips along Streets, along Sheriff Road, Plant Schedule 3

Length of Landscaped Strips	±440 feet
Width of Landscaped Strips	10+ feet
Shade Trees	13
Shrubs	90
Perennial Herbaceous Plants	674

Justification of Recommendation:

A 440-linear-foot segment along Sheriff Road is not in full compliance with Section 4.2 of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*. A portion of the required landscape strip proposes perennial herbaceous plant material, *Pennisetum alopecuroides* 'Hameln' and *Sedum telepium* 'Autumn Joy', as a substitute for some of the required shrubs in this segment of the landscape strip. The applicant also proposes to provide two of the required shade trees within a planting area in front of the proposed sanctuary, which is set back approximately 50-feet from the property line and right-of-way. This distribution of the plant material will allow more visibility to the proposed sign along the site's frontage and will provide additional enhancement to the front of the building. The Alternative Compliance Committee has no objection to the proposed layout along the frontage, and determines that the proposal will be an equally effective alternative to Section 4.2 of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*.

In review of the Section 4.2 Alternative Compliance request, the Committee noted that there are evergreen trees proposed within the landscape strips along Sheriff Road. Evergreen trees are not a recommended street tree as they can limit visual surveillance onto sites. The proposed evergreen trees were not included as a part of the Alternative Compliance request; however, the Committee recommends that the applicant replace the proposed evergreen trees in the landscape strips along streets with an equivalent amount of shade trees, at a 2:1 ratio, or an equal number of ornamental trees, where there are notable site constraints. The 4.2 schedules should be revised accordingly to indicate the change.

REQUEST 2: Section 4.2 Landscape Strips along Streets, along Sheriff Road.

REQUIRED: 4.2 Landscape Strips along Streets, along Sheriff Road, Plant Schedule

Length of Landscaped Strips	±191 feet
Width of Landscaped Strips	10 feet
Shade Trees	6
Shrubs	55

PROVIDED: 4.2 Landscape Strips along Streets, along Sheriff Road, Plant Schedule

Length of Landscaped Strips	±191 feet
Width of Landscaped Strips	10 feet
Shade Trees	2
Shrubs	100

Justification of Recommendation:

A 191-linear-foot segment along Sheriff Road is not in full compliance with Section 4.2 of the *Prince George’s County Landscape Manual*. There are two site constraints. The first is a 30-foot-wide Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC) right-of-way that abuts Sheriff Road and intrudes into the landscape strip. The applicant does not propose any plant materials within the WSSC right-of-way. The second is a retaining wall that is required to create a level area for a sidewalk, within the right-of-way. Due to the location of the retaining wall and the space limitations of the planting area, the applicant proposes to substitute shrubs for the required shade trees in this location. The retaining wall is 6-feet above grade and will be visible from Sheriff Road. The proposed shrubs in front of the retaining wall will soften and enhance views of the retaining wall from the public street. The applicant should correct Plant Schedule No. 4 on the submitted landscape plan to indicate that 100 shrubs are provided.

The Alternative Compliance Committee notes that the plant materials provided in this portion of the landscape strip will be comparable to those required under normal compliance with the *Prince George’s County Landscape Manual*. The Alternative Compliance Committee determines that the proposal will be equally effective as an alternative to Section 4.2 of the *Prince George’s County Landscape Manual*.

REQUEST 3: Section 4.2 Landscape Strips along Streets, along Hunt Avenue.

REQUIRED: 4.2 Landscape Strips along Streets, along Hunt Avenue, Plant Schedule 13

Length of Landscaped Strips	±149 feet
Width of Landscaped Strips	10 feet
Shade Trees	5
Shrubs	42

PROVIDED: 4.2 Landscape Strips along Streets, along Hunt Avenue, Plant Schedule 13

Length of Landscaped Strips	±149 feet
Width of Landscaped Strips	10 feet
Shade Trees	0
Ornamental Trees	9
Shrubs	48

Justification of Recommendation:

Alternative Compliance is required for the proposed plant substitutions along the Hunt Avenue 40-foot right-of-way. Hunt Avenue is an undeveloped and unutilized right-of-way (Paper Street) northwest of the site and adjacent to a storm water pond access drive/easement and underground utilities. The applicant is proposing the substitution of ornamental trees for the required shade trees within the proposed 10-foot-wide landscape strip to reduce disturbance that large tree growth may have on the adjacent utility and storm water access drive/easement. In the applicant's proposal, nine ornamental trees are substituted for the required shade trees, which demonstrate an acceptable substitution rate of 2 ornamentals for 1 shade tree. The Alternative Compliance Committee determines that the proposed plant substitutions will be an equally effective alternative to Section 4.2 of the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*.

Recommendation:

The Alternative Compliance Committee recommends APPROVAL of Alternative Compliance for Requests 1, 2, and 3, Section 4.2, Landscape Strips along Streets, along Sheriff Road and Hunt Avenue of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* subject to two conditions, which have been included in the Recommendation Section of this report.

- b. Section 4.3(c)(1), Parking Lot Perimeter Landscape Strip Requirements, requires a landscape strip in any zone when a parking lot is adjacent to a property line. The subject detailed site plan does not propose any parking lots adjacent to any property lines, except rights-of-way, so there are no requirements for this section.

Section 4.3(c)(2), Parking Interior Planting Requirements, requires a certain percentage of the parking lot, according to the size of the lot, to be interior planting area and to be planted with one shade tree for each 300 square feet of interior landscaped area provided. The DSP has multiple existing and proposed parking areas, all of which are subject to this section due to the fact that the proposed building expansion results in the creation of additional impervious area. The applicant has requested alternative compliance to this section for multiple parking areas. The findings of the Alternative Compliance Committee regarding this request are as follows:

REQUEST 4: Section 4.3(c)(2), Parking Lot Interior Planting Requirements

Surface parking on the subject site is proposed within six separate parking areas of which two are existing lots that will remain with minimal disturbance, two are new, and two are existing lots that will be modified substantially. Parking Lots 1, 2, and 3, are the subject of this alternative compliance request.

Parking Lot #1 – 40, 867 Square feet:

REQUIRED: 4.3(c)(2), Parking Lot Interior Planting Requirements, Parking Lot #1.

Interior Planting Area Required	3,269 sq. ft. or 8%
Number of Shade Trees Required	22

PROVIDED: 4.3(c)(2), Parking Lot Interior Planting Requirements, Parking Lot #1.

Interior Planting Area Provided	6,539 sq. ft. or 8%
Shade Trees Provided within the Interior Planting Area	14
Trees Provided within the Interior Planting Area and Parking Lot Perimeter*	25

**includes shades and ornamental trees*

Justification of Recommendation:

The applicant has filed this request for Alternative Compliance from Section 4.3(c)(2), Parking Lot Interior Planting Requirements, to reduce the required number of shade trees for Parking Lot #1. Parking Lot #1 is an existing overflow parking area, located in the western portion of the site, which will be modified substantially by the applicant’s proposal.

In this lot, the applicant is providing twice the amount of generally required interior green area. The number of shade trees required in a particular lot is based upon the amount of interior green *provided*. The Alternative Compliance Committee notes that if the applicant were to provide less interior green area, then the shade tree requirement would be less and would be met by the applicant’s proposal. The shade tree requirement is 22 shade trees based on the interior green area provided, and the applicant’s proposal demonstrates that only 14 shade trees are provided. While all of the required shade trees are not provided interior to the parking lot, there are 11 additional shade trees and ornamental trees proposed at the perimeter of the lot that meet the objectives of Section 4.3 by providing shade and visual relief within parking facilities, and minimizing the heat island effect created by large expanses of pavement. When the Alternative Compliance Committee gives consideration to those trees planted at the perimeter of Parking Lot #1, it finds that the proposed alternative landscape design will be an equally effective alternative to Section 4.3(c)(2) of the *Prince George’s County Landscape Manual*.

Parking Lot #2 – 40,945 square feet:

REQUIRED: 4.3(c)(2), Parking Lot Interior Planting Requirements, Parking Lot #2.

Interior Planting Area Required	3,276 sq. ft. or 8%
Number of Shade Trees Required	18

PROVIDED: 4.3(c)(2), Parking Lot Interior Planting Requirements, Parking Lot #2.

Interior Planting Area Provided	5,241 sq. ft. or 12.8%
Shade Trees Provided within the Interior	1
Trees Provided within the Interior Planting Area and Parking Lot Perimeter*	21

**includes shades and ornamental trees*

Justification of Recommendation:

The applicant has filed this request for Alternative Compliance from Section 4.3(c)(2), Parking Lot Interior Planting Requirements, to reduce the required number of shade trees for the Parking Lot #2. Parking Lot #2 is an existing lot, located west of the existing school building that will not be modified substantially by the applicant’s proposal.

The largest portion of the interior green area provided in the applicant’s proposal is an existing memorial garden. This garden has a social function for the church community and it is planted and maintained by church members. The Alternative Compliance Committee recognizes that it may be inappropriate to disturb the memorial garden by the planting of additional shade trees to meet the interior planting requirement. The existing ornamental trees provided within the memorial garden beautify the parking area and further the goals of Section 4.3.

Overall, eleven ornamental trees are provided within interior green areas, and there are additional shade and ornamental trees proposed at the perimeter of the lot, including between the school building and Parking Lot #2. The Alternative Compliance Committee finds that the proposed alternative landscape design will be an equally effective alternative to Section 4.3(c)(2) of the *Prince George’s County Landscape Manual*.

Parking Lot #3 – 37,382 square feet:

REQUIRED: 4.3(c)(2), Parking Lot Interior Planting Requirements, Parking Lot #3.

Interior Planting Area Required	2,991 sq. ft. or 8%
Number of Shade Trees Required	14

PROVIDED: 4.3(c)(2), Parking Lot Interior Planting Requirements, Parking Lot #3.

Interior Planting Area Provided	4,000 sq. ft. or 10.7%
Shade Trees Provided within the Interior Planting	5
Trees Provided within the Interior Planting Area and	19
Parking Lot Perimeter*	

**includes shades and ornamental trees*

Justification of Recommendation:

The applicant has filed this request for Alternative Compliance from Section 4.3(c)(2), Parking Lot Interior Planting Requirements, to reduce the required number of shade trees for Parking Lot #3. Parking Lot #3 is an existing lot, located southeast of the existing school building and existing sanctuary that will not be modified substantially by the applicant's proposal.

Instead of removing areas of existing asphalt to meet the Section 4.3 requirement the applicant proposes to plant seven additional shade trees and three ornamental trees to supplement the 9 existing plant materials that exist at the perimeter of Parking Lot #3. Those additional shade and ornamental trees at the perimeter of Parking Lot #3 meet the objectives of Section 4.3 of the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* by providing shade and visual relief within parking facilities, and minimizing the heat island effect created by large expanses of pavement. When the Alternative Compliance Committee gives consideration to those trees planted at the perimeter of Parking Lot #3, it finds that the proposed alternative landscape design will be an equally effective alternative to Section 4.3(c)(2) of the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*.

Recommendation:

The Alternative Compliance Committee recommends APPROVAL of Alternative Compliance for Section 4.3(c)(2), Parking Lot Interior Planting Requirements, for Parking Lots 1, 2, and 3, of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*.

- c. Section 4.4, Screening Requirements, requires that all dumpsters and loading spaces be screened from all adjacent public roads. The two required loading spaces and the proposed dumpster are located behind and to the south of the proposed gymnasium and are completely screened from Sheriff Road by the proposed buildings.
- d. Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, requires a buffer between adjacent incompatible land uses. A church and school are defined as medium impact uses; therefore, the subject property would require Section 4.7 bufferyards where it is adjacent to an animal shelter, a high-impact use, in the northeast; single-family detached homes in the east; a cemetery, a low-impact use, in the south; a vacant, M-U-I-zoned parcel in the

west; and a fast-food restaurant in the northwest. The landscape plan provides the appropriate schedules; however, some of them are completed incorrectly or do not correspond to what is labeled and shown on the landscape plan itself. These schedules and the landscape plan, specifically for Bufferyards 7, 9, 10, 11 and 12, should be revised to be complete and correct. A condition requiring this has been included in the Recommendation Section of this report.

- e. Section 4.9, Sustainable Landscaping Requirements, requires certain percentages of native plants be provided on-site, along with no invasive plants, and no plants being planted on slopes steeper than three-to-one. The landscape plan provided the appropriate schedule; however, it was completed incorrectly and should be revised to reflect the correct number of provided and required plants. The proposed plant list includes many native plants, and it appears the requirements have been met, so the schedule just needs to be revised. A condition requiring this has been included in the Recommendation Section of this report.

- 11. **Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance and the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance:** The subject DSP proposes to construct a new sanctuary, gymnasium and additional parking on an existing developed site with a previously approved Detailed Site Plan DSP-91071 and Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCP2/129/91. Because of the substantial change to the previously approved limits of disturbance (LOD), the site is now subject to the requirements of both the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance and the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance.

- a. **Subtitle 25 Division 2: Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance—** This project is subject to the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance because, although it has a previously approved tree conservation plan that was approved under the 1989 woodland conservation requirements, the proposed limits of disturbance with this application have significantly changed. A revised Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan, TCP2-129-91-02, reflecting the current woodland conservation requirements, has been submitted.

The site has a woodland conservation requirement of 5.17 acres. The TCP2 proposes to meet the requirement with 4.93 acres of on-site woodland preservation and 0.36 acres of on-site woodland reforestation, which will exceed the requirement. The entire woodland conservation requirement will be met on-site. Woodland preservation is focused in the priority areas of the site, adjacent to the stream valley areas. The Environmental Planner discussed various technical issues regarding labeling and linework that need to be revised on the TCP2 prior to certification and these conditions have been included in the Recommendation Section of this report.

Additionally, the site contains 21 specimen trees numbered T29 through T46. The plan proposes to remove six specimen trees (T30 and T41-46). The removal of specimen trees T41, T42, T43, T44, T45 and T46 were approved to be removed with the previously approved TCP2. These trees can be removed without the submittal of a variance because they were approved for removal prior to the enactment of the current regulations that require a variance for the removal of specimen trees. The current regulations require the preservation of specimen trees (Section 25-122(b)(1)(G)) unless a variance has been approved.

Specimen tree T30 is subject to the current regulation that requires a variance for the removal of specimen trees because it was not shown to be removed on the previously approved TCP2. It appears that the removal of this tree is necessary for a proposed vehicular entrance into the site.

A variance application for the removal of specimen tree 30 has been submitted. Section 25-119(d)(1) contains six required findings to be made before a variance from the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance can be granted. An evaluation of this variance request with respect to the required findings is provided as follows:

(A) Special conditions peculiar to the property have caused the unwarranted hardship

Comment: The site is located on Sherriff Road, a designated arterial roadway that receives high volumes of traffic that necessitates a safe sight distance to exit the site. According to the applicant's justification, the proposed access point at this location is appropriate in order to provide adequate and safe sight distance for entry and exit to the site. The entrance will also improve on-site circulation for vehicles entering and leaving the site due to the additional parking area proposed in this design. The entrance cannot be relocated farther east because it is adjacent to the PMA. If moved farther west, the entrance would be too close to an existing entrance and may create an unsafe traffic condition. If the site is developed without this proposed entrance, it would create an unwarranted hardship and possible unsafe circulation on the traffic in this area.

(B) Enforcement of these rules will deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by others in similar areas

Comment: If other properties encounter protected trees in similar locations on a site where vehicular access is necessary for the safety and welfare of vehicular circulation, the same considerations would be provided during the review of the required variance application.

(C) Granting the variance will not confer on the applicant a special privilege that would be denied to other applicants

Comment: If other properties encountered protected trees in similar conditions and locations on a site, the same considerations would be provided during the review of the required variance application.

(D) The request is not based on conditions or circumstances which are the result of actions by the applicant

Comment: The request is not based on conditions or circumstances which are the result of actions by the applicant because the entrance has not been built.

(E) The request does not arise from a condition relating to land or building use, either permitted or nonconforming, on a neighboring property

Comment: The request to remove the specimen tree does not arise from any condition on a neighboring property.

(F) Granting of the variance will not adversely affect water quality

Comment: Granting the variance to remove the specimen tree will not directly affect water quality because new stormwater management features are proposed for this site, which currently does not have any.

Staff recommends that the Planning Board determine that the required findings of Section 25-119(d) have been adequately addressed for the removal of specimen tree 30.

- b. **Subtitle 25 Division 3: Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance**—Section 25-128 of the Prince George’s County Code requires a minimum percentage of tree canopy coverage (TCC) on properties that require a grading permit. Properties zoned R-80 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 18.12 acres and, as such, tree canopy coverage of 2.72 acres is required. This requirement will be met and exceeded with the proposed woodland conservation of 5.29 acres. A TCC worksheet has been provided on the landscape plan; however, the gross tract area and TCC required is incorrect and, therefore, a condition requiring this to be corrected has been included in the Recommendation Section of this report.

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

- a. **Historic Preservation**—In an e-mail dated June 3, 2011, the Historic Preservation Section stated that the subject project would have no effect on Historic Sites, Resources or Districts.
- b. **Community Planning Division**—In comments dated June 8, 2011, the Community Planning Division stated that the application is not inconsistent with the 2002 *Prince George’s County Approve General Plan* Development Pattern policies for the Developed Tier and conforms to the institutional land use recommendations of the 2010 *Approved Subregion 4 Master Plan and Adopted Sectional Map Amendment*. They also noted that the master plan does not provide guidance for building heights for the subject property in regards to the requested variance to increase the building height of the new sanctuary in the R-80 Zone to 59 feet, 19 feet above the 40-foot maximum building height permitted in the R-80 Zone.
- c. **Transportation Planning Section**—In a memorandum dated July 11, 2011, the Transportation Planning Section provided a review of the detailed site plan application as follows:

The Transportation Planning Section has reviewed the detailed site plan revision application referenced above. The subject property consists of 18.12 acres of land in the R-80 and C-M zones. The property is on the south side of Sheriff Road to the east of its intersection with Martin Luther King Jr. Highway (MD 704). The property has an approved site plan for the 800-seat church sanctuary building, a 117-student day care facility, a 250-student private school for grades K-8, and approximately 1,064 square-foot related office building. The submitted plan proposes the construction of a new sanctuary, which would increase the size of the existing church on the site from 800 seats to 1,200 seats. The plan includes

the demolition of the existing sanctuary building, and replacing it with a new gymnasium with indoor track, game room, youth activity room, children's play room and a small café to be used only by the existing school and daycare students with approved enrollment caps of 250 and 117, respectively. The plan also shows modification and expansion of the existing 304 parking spaces into a 501 surface parking space compound, or 156 spaces more than the required number of parking spaces for the proposed uses.

The underlying approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-98052. The preliminary plan has no condition which caps development on the site, but Finding 7 of that resolution states that no new trips are proposed. Additionally, other materials included in the preliminary plan file indicate that there was no effort made to evaluate any possible expansion of the uses on the site so that traffic impacts could be properly assessed. In response to the above-cited concerns and as part of the evaluation of Detailed Site Plan DSP-91071-01, staff reviewed an applicant's prepared traffic impact study dated March 2003. The purpose of this review was not to make an adequacy finding associated with this detailed site plan, but to provide justification for the extent of any future expansion of the uses and to clarify the adequacy findings made at the time of the preliminary plan. To this end and by using appropriate trip generation rates and pass-by rate for both the school and the day care uses, the Planning Board approval (PGCPB Resolution No. 03-139) for Detailed Site Plan DSP-91071-01 includes discussions on the total projected new weekday peak-hour vehicle trips for the site as 177 AM (105 in and 72 out) and 54 PM (22 in and 32 out), without limiting the amount of future development levels or mandating any specific weekday or weekend peak hour trip caps.

To adequately compare the potential trip generation of the proposed uses with the levels discussed above, the attached new trip generation report (dated June 27, 2011) was prepared and submitted in support of the proposed plan, and this report was reviewed by staff. While the submitted theoretical analysis report shows potential increases in new weekday trips, stated earlier, by 14 AM and 9 PM trips during the weekday peak hours, staff concurs with the report's conclusion that there is no basis to assume that these increases in new weekday trips would be realized since the gym is intended as an ancillary use to existing uses, and the church's administrative staff (the key weekday trip generator) is already in place. To further justify this assertion, the applicant has indicated there are no plans, nor any need, to increase the number of church's administrative staff in response to the proposed increase in sanctuary seating.

The site access is limited to Sheriff Road. Currently there are three access driveways serving the site, and all are acceptable. The plan proposes no changes to the existing access configuration.

Based on the preceding findings, the Transportation Planning Section concludes that the submitted detailed site plan is acceptable and meets the criteria of site plan approval, from the standpoint of transportation, as noted in Subtitle 27.

- d. **Subdivision Section**—In a memorandum dated July 14, 2011, the Subdivision Section gave a brief summary of the property, previous preliminary plan of subdivision approval, and the need for a minor plat of subdivision to consolidate the various properties shown

on the DSP. This has been included as a condition of approval in the Recommendation Section of this report.

- e. **Trails**—In a memorandum dated June 8, 2011, the trails planner indicated that from the standpoint of non-motorized transportation, it is determined that this plan is acceptable, fulfills the intent of applicable master plans and functional plans, fulfills prior conditions of approval, and meets the findings required for a detailed site plan as described in Section 27-285 of the Zoning Ordinance with the addition of conditions as included in the Recommendation Section of this report.
- f. **Permit Review Section**—In a memorandum dated May 25, 2011, the Permit Review Section offered several comments which are either not applicable at this time, have been addressed through revisions to the plans, or are addressed through proposed conditions of approval of this detailed site plan.
- g. **Public Facilities**—In a memorandum dated May 11, 2011, the Special Projects Section of the Countywide Planning Division stated that they reviewed the subject DSP for informational purposes only, that the required fire, rescue, and police facilities have been determined to be adequate but that there is no requirement for adequacy at the time of detailed site plan.
- h. **Environmental Planning Section**—In a memorandum dated July 1, 2011, the Environmental Planning Section provided a comprehensive review of the DSP's conformance with the requirements of the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance, the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance, the Natural Resources Inventory, and the approved stormwater management concept. The Environmental Planning Section recommended approval of Detailed Site Plan DSP-91071-02, Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan TCP2-129-91-02, and the specimen tree removal variance with one condition that has been addressed by the applicant during the review process.
- i. **Fire/EMS Department**—At the time of the writing of this technical staff report, comments have not been received from the Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department.
- j. **Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T)**—In a memorandum dated May 26, 2011, DPW&T stated that they had no objection to this DSP and provided a standard response on issues such as frontage improvements, soils, storm drainage systems, and utilities in order to be in accordance with the requirements of DPW&T. Those issues will be enforced by DPW&T at the time of the issuance of permits. DPW&T also indicated that the subject DSP is consistent with approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan 16624-2009, dated February 14, 2011. In a separate letter dated September 29, 2010, DPW&T indicated that they had no objection to the placement of the proposed sign within the public utility easement (PUE), provided that all of the utility companies that are a party to the PUE agreement are also in agreement.
- k. **Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA)**—At the time of writing of this technical staff report, comments have not been received from SHA.
- l. **Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)**—In an e-mail dated April 27, 2010, WSSC indicated that they had no issue with the proposed sign location within the public utility easement (PUE). They did not provide any other comments on

the plan at the time of writing of this technical staff report.

- m. **Verizon**—In an e-mail dated April 28, 2010, Verizon indicated that they had no objection to the proposed freestanding sign being located within the public utility easement (PUE) as long as three four-inch ducts were provided under the footing of the sign, which the applicant has provided.
 - n. **Potomac Electric Power Company (PEPCO)**—In a letter dated September 24, 2010, PEPCO indicated that they had no objection to the proposed freestanding sign location within the public utility easement (PUE) with the understanding that PEPCO may remove part of or the entire sign in the event of new construction and/or the need to perform maintenance of the electric system in close proximity to the sign.
 - o. **American Telephone & Telegraph (AT&T)**—In a letter dated April 9, 2010, AT&T indicated that they had no facilities in the area of the proposed project that would conflict with the location of the proposed freestanding sign.
 - p. **Washington Gas**—In a letter dated April 16, 2010, Washington Gas indicated that they had no objection to the proposed freestanding sign location as it does not conflict with the gas service.
13. 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.
14. Per Section 27-285(b) (4) of the Zoning Ordinance, which became effective on September 1, 2010, a required finding for approval of a detailed site plan is as follows:

The Planning Board may approve a Detailed Site Plan if it finds that the regulated environmental features have been preserved and/or restored in a natural state to the fullest extent possible.

Comment: In a memorandum dated July 1, 2011, the Environmental Planning staff provided the following analysis:

The site is not subject to the environmental regulations of Subtitle 27 that became effective on September 1, 2010, because the site has a previously approved Detailed Site Plan; hence, the finding of “fullest extent possible” per 27-285(b)(4) is not required for the subject site.

RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the foregoing evaluation, analysis, and findings, the Urban Design staff recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and APPROVE Detailed Site Plan DSP-91071-02 and Alternative Compliance AC-92064-01 for First Baptist Church of Highland Park, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Prior to signature approval of the detailed site plan, the following information shall be provided, notes added, or revisions made:

- a. Add the church's tax exempt identification number to the General Notes.
- b. Provide the breakdown and calculations for the proposed lot coverage.
- c. Revise the DSP to correct any discrepancies among labels and notes for the play area provided for the school.
- d. Revise the DSP to note the limited hours of operation of the outdoor play area.
- e. Revise the DSP to show all of the previously approved landscaping that needs to be removed and replaced or replanted per the landscape certification plan.
- f. Label the freestanding sign advertising the private school, located near the existing western driveway entrance, as to be removed.
- g. The dumpster enclosure detail shall indicate that the enclosure will be made of brick or clad with brick veneer.
- h. Provide the six-foot, eight-inch-wide decorative sidewalk along the subject site's entire frontage of Sheriff Road, unless modified by the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T).
- i. Revise the plans to show shared-lane markings for bicycles shall be provided along the subject site's entire frontage of Sheriff Road, unless modified by DPW&T. All pavement markings shall be consistent with the Federal Highway Administration's 2009 Edition of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), Section 9C.07, unless modified by DPW&T or other applicable regulatory authority.
- j. In conjunction with the shared-lane markings, the applicant shall provide a minimum of two "Bicycles May Use Full Lane" signs (R4-11, MUTCD) along Sheriff Road, consistent with the Federal Highway Administration's 2009 Edition of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), Section 9B.06, unless modified by DPW&T or other applicable regulatory authority.
- k. Provide an additional sidewalk connection with ADA curb cuts, ramps and marked crosswalk) from Sheriff Road to the walkway around the proposed sanctuary at the site's ingress/egress point opposite of Willowood Court.
- l. Provide a marked crosswalk with ADA curb cuts and ramps from the sidewalk connection off Sheriff Road (reflected on the submitted plans) across the one-way drive aisle to the sidewalk in front of the sanctuary and gymnasium.
- m. Provide marked crosswalks with appropriate ADA curb cuts and ramps across the drive aisle to the sidewalk around the sanctuary from the two walkways/stairs from the upper parking lot.
- n. Revise the site plan to demonstrate the height and dimensions for the proposed sanctuary and gymnasium buildings.
- o. Revise the tree canopy coverage worksheet to reflect the correct gross tract area and tree canopy coverage required.

- p. The TCP2 shall be revised as follows
 - (1) Remove the symbol for “woodland cleared” from the legend.
 - (2) Remove the existing Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC) area (clearing area E) from the limit of disturbance (LOD) and show it to be preserved, counted as cleared. The area of woodland in this area shall remain counted as cleared.
 - (3) Have the plans signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared them.
 - q. Revise the landscape plan to show decorative-type plantings, including ornamental trees, shrubs, perennials and annuals, immediately adjacent to the north and east sides of the proposed sanctuary and the north side of the proposed gymnasium, where space allows outside of minimum sidewalk widths.
 - r. Revise the Section 4.2 schedules and landscape strips, specifically for Landscape Strips 4, 5, 6, 8, and 13, to be complete and correct.
 - s. Revise the Section 4.7 schedules and bufferyards, specifically for Bufferyards 7, 9, 10, 11 and 12, to be complete and correct.
 - t. Revise the Section 4.9, Sustainable Landscaping Requirements, schedule to reflect the correct number of provided and required plants in relation to the plant lists for each category.
 - u. Either obtain approval for a departure from sign design standards from Section 27-617(a) of the Zoning Ordinance for the proposed freestanding sign, or revise the proposed sign to conform with the Zoning Ordinance provisions.
 - v. The evergreen trees proposed in the Section 4.2, landscape strips along Sheriff Road, shall be replaced with the equivalent value of shade trees or ornamental trees.
 - w. Planting Schedule No. 4 shall be revised to indicate that 100 shrubs are provided, in lieu of the required shade trees, in the area closest to the proposed retaining wall.
 - x. Revise the DSP to reflect the landscaping and schedules as shown on the approved Alternative Compliance plan.
2. Prior to the Maryland-National Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) approval of building permits, a minor plat of subdivision pursuant to Section 24-108(a)(3) of the Subdivision Regulations, shall be required to consolidate Parcel C, Lots 17, 18, 21, 22 and part of Hunter Avenue and Park Avenue vacated by Vacation Petition V-09005 and as reflected on the approved detailed site plan (DSP).