

March 3, 2003

PLANNING DIRECTOR DECISION Limited Departures and Revisions to Approved Plans

Application No: ROSP SE-3735/01

Project Name: Storage USA

Reviewer's Name: Catherine H. Wallace, Planner Coordinator

A. **Nature of the Applicant's Request:** This minor revision was filed for a consolidated storage facility initially approved in 1987 in order to accommodate the prototypical architecture of the current owner. The proposed facility will retain the previously approved mix of one- and two-story buildings and their locations on the site. The applicant has also filed a tree conservation plan and landscape plan in accordance with the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance enacted since the initial approval of this special exception.

B. **Required Findings:**

Section 27-325 (c). Limited Minor Changes—Planning Director

- (1) The Planning Director is authorized to approve minor changes administratively, without public hearing, only if the proposed minor changes are limited in scope and nature, including an increase in gross floor area or land covered by a structure other than a building up to ten percent. The Director shall deny any administrative approval request proposing site plan changes that will have a significant impact on adjacent property.
- (2) Before approving a minor change, the Director shall make all findings the Planning Board would be required to make, if it reviewed the application.
- (3) The Director is not authorized to waive requirements in this Subtitle, grant variances, or modify conditions, considerations, or other requirements imposed by the Planning Board or District Council in any case.
- (4) The applicant's property shall be posted within ten days of the Director's acceptance of the filing of the application. Posting shall be in accordance with Part 3, Division 1. On and after the first day of posting, the application may not be amended.

- (5) The Director may waive posting after determining, in writing, that the proposed minor change is so limited in scope and nature that it will have no appreciable impact on adjacent property.
- (6) If posting is waived or a written request for public hearing is not submitted within the posted time period, then the Director may act on the application. The Director's approval concludes all proceedings.
- (7) If the Director denies the application or a timely hearing request is submitted, then the application shall be treated as re-filed on the date of that event. The applicant, Director, and technical staff shall then follow the procedures for Planning Board review.

Sec. 27-344.01. Consolidated Storage—Specific Requirements

- (a) Consolidated storage may be permitted, subject to the following:
 - (1) The application shall be accompanied by:
 - (A) An impact statement explaining:
 - (i) The nature and scope of the operation; and
 - (ii) The type and amount of traffic expected to be generated;
 - (B) A description (graphic and narrative) of the proposed architectural facade of the building.
 - (2) The subject property shall have frontage on, and direct vehicular access to, an existing street with sufficient capacity to accommodate the type and amount of traffic expected to be generated by the use;
 - (3) The use shall be appropriate, given the nature of development in the neighborhood; and
 - (4) The District Council shall find that:
 - (A) There is a need for the public in the surrounding area;
 - (5) The exterior and architectural facade of the building shall be compatible with the prevailing architecture and appearance of other development in the surrounding neighborhood;
 - (6) Beginning June 23, 1988, no entrances to individual consolidated storage units shall be visible from a street or from adjoining land in any residential or commercial zone (or land proposed to be used for residential or commercial purposes on an approved basic plan for a comprehensive design zone, or any approved conceptual or detailed site plan);
 - (7) Entrances to individual consolidated storage units shall be either oriented toward the interior of the development or completely screened from view by a solid wall, with landscaping along the outside thereof; and

- (8) Consolidated storage for which special exceptions were approved prior to the date reflected in paragraph 6, above, need not meet the provisions set forth in paragraphs 6 and 7, above.
- (b) In addition to what is required by Section 27-296(c)(1)(B), the site plan shall show the topography of the subject lot and abutting lots (for a depth of at least 50 feet).

Sec. 27-317. Special Exceptions—General Requirements

- (a) A special exception may be approved if:
 - (1) The proposed use and site plan are in harmony with the purpose of this Subtitle;
 - (2) The proposed use is in conformance with all the applicable requirements and regulations of this Subtitle;
 - (3) The proposed use will not substantially impair the integrity of any validly approved master plan or functional master plan, or, in the absence of a master plan or functional master plan, the General Plan;
 - (4) The proposed use will not adversely affect the health, safety, or welfare of residents or workers in the area;
 - (5) The proposed use will not be detrimental to the use or development of adjacent properties or the general neighborhood; and
 - (6) The proposed site plan is in conformance with an approved tree conservation plan.

C. **Determinations:**

- 1. The subject property is a 3.34-acre parcel located on the east side of Whitney Place approximately 400 feet north of Marlboro Pike. It is zoned C-M. It is surrounded by the following uses:
 - North— Single-family detached residences in the R-55 Zone.
 - East— Cemetery in the R-55 Zone and multifamily dwellings in the R-18 Zone.
 - South— Bobcat sales and service dealer with outdoor storage in the C-M Zone, two mattress and carpet dealers, and a paint retailer in the C-S-C Zone.
 - West— Two-story office building (Amalgamated Transit Workers) in the C-S-C Zone and McNamara High School in the R-55 Zone
- 2. The property was posted for the 20-day period from December 27, 2002, to January 15, 2003, in conformance with the requirements of Section 27-325(c)(4). There was no request submitted for a public hearing.
- 3. The proposed revision meets the criteria for a limited minor change approvable by the

Planning Director. The proposed changes are minor in scope and nature. The proposed gross floor area is slightly smaller than the area originally approved and lies within the footprint of the originally approved buildings. The proposed changes will have no appreciable effect on adjacent properties. The Urban Design staff reviewed the plans and found them acceptable. The architecture and proposed building materials and colors on the revised plan are compatible with the surrounding commercial development, which includes a two-story white concrete building, several cinderblock buildings, and two brick buildings.

- 4. The proposed revision conforms to the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and the conditions of approval of the original special exception. The architecture, building materials and color scheme, which is predominantly grey and white, are similar in character to that approved by the District Council in 1987.
- 5. The proposed revision does not alter the previous findings of the District Council with regard to the nature and scope of the operation and the type and amount of traffic to be generated.
- 6. The subject property has frontage on and direct vehicular access to Whitney Place, an existing street with sufficient capacity to accommodate the type and amount of traffic expected to be generated by the use.
- 7. The proposed storage facility will serve the surrounding residential and commercial development as previously determined by the District Council.
- 8. The entrances to the individual storage units will be located to the interior of the development and will not be visible to surrounding properties and to Whitney Place.
- 9. The proposed revision includes a landscape plan that meets the requirements of the *Landscape Manual* and will provide appropriate landscaping and bufferyards to ensure compatibility with the surrounding uses.
- 10. A tree conservation plan (TCP) was not required at the time of the previous approval but is required for the revised application. A TCP was submitted and revised in accordance with the comments of the Environmental Planning Section. The revised TCP I (dated 2/5/03) conforms to the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance.
- 11. The proposed revisions will not alter the previous findings of compatibility with the surrounding area, conformance with the regulations of the Zoning Ordinance, or impairment of the *Suitland-District Heights and Vicinity Master Plan*.
- 12. The parking schedule on the site plan must be corrected to show that 1,400 gross square feet of office space require six parking spaces, not three as shown. A total of 19 spaces are required and are provided.

D. **Recommendation:**

Based on the above findings, it is recommended that ROSP SE-3735/01 be APPROVED. Prior to certification of the plans, the parking schedule shall be corrected to show six spaces required for the office space and 19 spaces required for the entire development.

*	*	*	*	*	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *								
					By:_					I	Oate:		
					Arie Stouten, AICP, Zoning Supervisor								