

C O R R E C T E D   R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board is charged with the approval of Detailed Site Plans pursuant to Part 3, Division 9 of the Zoning Ordinance of the Prince George's County Code; and

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on January 23, 2020, regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-19001 for JSF Annapolis Road, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The subject detailed site plan (DSP) is to allow a consolidated storage use and construct a 133,000-square-foot building, with associated approximately 1,830 square feet of office/retail use.
2. **Development Data Summary:**

	<b>EXISTING</b>	<b>APPROVED</b>
Zone	M-U-I/D-D-O	M-U-I/D-D-O
Total Site Area	1.094 acres	1.094 acres
Use(s)	Daycare	Consolidated Storage, Accessory retail/office
Total Building Gross Floor Area (GFA)	2,350 sq. ft.	133,000 sq. ft
of which Consolidated Storage		1,300 units/131,170 sq. ft.
Office/Retail		824 sq. ft.
Community Incubator		1,006 sq. ft.

**Other Development Data:**

	<b>MAXIMUM/MINIMUM</b> *	<b>APPROVED</b>
Parking Spaces	34/17	12
	<b>REQUIRED**</b>	<b>APPROVED</b>
Loading Spaces	6	2

**Note:** \*Per Section 27-568(a) of the Zoning Ordinance, one parking space is required per 50 units of consolidated storage having direct access only from within a building, plus four per 1,000 sq. ft. of GFA of office space, and one space per 250 sq. ft. of the first 2,000 sq. ft. of GFA incubator office. Per the 2010 *Central Annapolis Road Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment*, 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 as discussed in Finding 7.

*\*\*The 2010 Central Annapolis Road Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment does not have specific requirements for the number of loading spaces; therefore, the applicable section of the Zoning Ordinance serves as the requirement. A departure from the number of loading spaces is required, as discussed in Finding 8 below.*

3. **Location:** The subject property is located on the south side of MD 450 (Annapolis Road) at its intersection with 68th Avenue in Council District 5, and Planning Area 69 in the municipality of Landover Hills. The address is 6801 Annapolis Road, Hyattsville, Maryland known as Lot 7, Block E of the Grayling Subdivision, recorded in Plat Book WWW 38-16 on March 3, 1960, and is located on Tax Map 51 in Grid C-2.
4. **Surrounding Uses:** The subject property is surrounded by a mix of commercial and residential uses. The property is bordered to the west by the MD 450 right-of-way and beyond are properties in the Mixed Use-Infill (M-U-I) Zone and Development District Overlay (D-D-O) Zone of the 2010 *Approved Central Annapolis Road Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (Central Annapolis Road Sector Plan and SMA), developed with a mix of commercial uses including the Landover Hills Volunteer Fire Station and a filling-station. The property is bordered to the northeast by commercial properties in the M-U-I and D-D-O Zones. East of the subject site is Multifamily Medium Density Residential (R-18)-Zoned property known as the Ashford at Cooper's Crossing apartments. South of the subject site is the Crestview Square Shopping Center in the M-U-I and D-D-O Zones, and a townhome development known as Cooper's Landing in the R-18 Zone. Beyond the immediate property vicinity are One-Family Detached Residential-Zoned properties.
5. **Previous Approvals:** The property was the subject of Record Plat WWW 38-16. DSP-94038 was originally approved in 1994 for a daycare on the subject property and amended twice. The existing buildings on-site were built in conformance with that approval. The 2010 Central Annapolis Road Sector Plan and SMA reclassified the subject property from the Commercial Shopping Center (C-S-C) to the M-U-I Zone and imposed the D-D-O Zone.
6. **Design Features:** The subject application proposes the construction of a seven-story, 133,000-square-foot consolidated storage building including 1,300 storage units, 824 square feet of retail/office space, and 1,006 square feet of incubator office. The current proposal is to raze the existing one-story building on-site, which is being used as a day care facility.

The site has a single access point from MD 450, directly east of 68th Avenue, in the same location as one of the two existing access points. A 12-space surface parking lot and two loading spaces are located on the south side of the building. A sidewalk on the north side of the property leads pedestrians from MD 450 to the office incubator front door and then follows the building around to the south side and to the doors for access to the office and storage units. A large retaining wall, up to 9.6-feet-high, is proposed along the southern boundary, and stormwater facilities are located on the east/rear side of the building. No outdoor trash facility is proposed. At

the public hearing, the applicant presented a revised site plan, as shown in multiple exhibits, that showed a plaza with benches in front of the building along MD 450 and a brick screening wall in front of the surface parking lot.

### **Architecture**

The application, as originally submitted, proposes a four- to seven-story building that is composed of exterior insulation finishing system (EIFS), brick, cementitious fiber board, split face block, spandrel glass, aluminum store front windows, and composite metal panels. The main building elevations are directed towards MD 450 and 68th Avenue. The original building design was a mix of styles and lacks uniform design or architectural rhythm. The front of the building is four-stories above ground level and rear of the building is seven-stories, as the topography on the site drops away from MD 450. The northwest corner of the building is made of glass and metal panels. On the front façade, ground floor windows and a doorway are surrounded by a base of red split face block. Two bands of red brick define the second and third stories and gray EIFS caps the building front façade and builds off the glass corner element. Two windows are provided on the ground floor of the north elevation with faux windows above and the façade is capped with EIFS and signage.

The red split face block continues down a third of the north elevation's ground floor. The north elevation's long mass is broken up by a mixture of tan and gray EIFS columns, three columns of different sized faux EIFS windows surrounded by brick and cementitious siding. In the middle of the north façade is a large section of cementitious siding framing a large square of gray EIFS.

The east elevation, as originally submitted, is a seven-story-high tan wall composed of EIFS that faces neighboring apartment buildings. There are some vertical joint lines, but no other articulation. A condition of approval will enhance this elevation by requiring the addition of art, a building tattoos or supergraphics at the upper three stories of this elevation. The south elevation has entrance features with the continuation of glass elements at the southwest corner, red brick surrounding storefront windows, and faux cementitious windows above. The two doors to the storage units on this elevation are surrounded by vertical sections of red brick with tan EIFS inlays and projected roof lines. The south façade, adjacent to the parking lot, highlights the entrance, uses high-quality materials and is broken into a bottom, middle, and top. The east side of this façade, as offered at the Planning Board hearing will be a mixture of concrete masonry units, red brick, cementitious siding, EIFS faux windows and EIFS trim accents.

On page 163 of the Central Annapolis Road Sector Plan and SMA, under the Style and detail D-D-O standard section, it states that low-quality materials, such as EIFS, should be minimized and masked wherever possible. While the architecture, as originally submitted, does propose EIFS mainly on the rear of the building, there are still areas where it is the primary building material and not minimized or masked.

The applicant presented revised architecture at the public hearing, as shown in Applicant's Exhibit #1, which the Planning Board approves as the final architecture. The revised architecture included more masonry and cementitious paneling on the north, south, and east elevations to further minimize the EIFS on the building. These materials were arranged as faux windows and

vertical columns along these facades. The Planning Board approves an amendment for the height of the building to ensure that 7 stories would be permitted. The revised architecture showed conformance with D-D-O standards for design and ground floor height previously requested for amendment. The Planning Board included conditions herein to ensure compliance with the D-D-O standards and to further enhance the eastern elevation. The Planning Board finds the revised architecture, including building materials, to be satisfactory.

### **Signage**

The subject application proposes three building-mounted signs and one freestanding sign. The building-mounted signs will be placed at the top of the building on the north, east, and south elevations. The building-mounted signs will be back-lit, acrylic channel letters mounted on a gray raceway, and 140 square feet each. The freestanding sign will be an aluminum cabinet with vinyl letters, 8 feet tall and 50 square feet. The sign will be placed along the MD 450 frontage on the north side of the vehicular access to the site. The sign will be set on the 3-foot-high red brick base and will not be illuminated. The Planning Board approves the proposed signage which complies with the applicable development district standards.

### **Landscaping**

The site shows landscaping along the front and the rear of the property. There are three evergreen trees proposed on the southern property line that help screen the loading area and one tree within a parking lot landscape island. 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 2010 Approved Central Annapolis Road Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment and Development District Overlay (D-D-O) Zone:** The subject site is located within the Mixed-Use Transition area of the Central Annapolis Road Sector Plan and SMA, which defines the purpose of this 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 142)**

The sector plan places the subject property in the Mixed-Use Transition character area. The goals for this character area are to establish a low- to moderate-density mixed-use, multifamily neighborhood to serve as a transition between the existing single-family neighborhoods to the north and south and the retail to the southwest and encourage infill opportunities for workforce housing by providing new opportunities for the development of multifamily residential units (page 80).

The sector plan includes illustrative drawings of the long-term redevelopment of the subject site. Block-style development of multifamily buildings with ground floor retail fronting MD 450 are included in the long-term vision. A new service road between Cooper Lane and 68th Place and a neighborhood-scaled park on the rear of this property and the adjoining are discussed as a strategy for the further improvement of the subject area. The sector plan rezoned the subject site from the C-S-C Zone to the M-U-I Zone to implement the vision of the plan.

The applicant presented revised architecture and site design, in multiple exhibits entered into the record, that the Planning Board approves with conditions for the DSP. The applicant presented 18 exhibits and five expert witnesses at the Planning Board hearing. The witnesses included a civil engineer, multifamily broker, and multifamily developer and builder who argued multifamily development could not be built on the site given its size and topography, and how the proposed consolidated storage use and envisioned multifamily use are complementary. The Mayor of Landover Hills stated his support for the proposed development, and a land planner consultant argued that the sector plan's vision had not been implemented in 10 years and was not obtainable.

#### **REQUESTED AMENDMENT TO APPROVED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT OVERLAY ZONE**

The Central Annapolis Road D-D-O requires that the uses on included properties shall be the same as those allowed in the underlying zones (page 139). Uses in the M-U-I Zone are governed by Section 27-546.17(a) of the Zoning Ordinance, which states:

- (a) All uses permitted by right or by Special Exception in the C-S-C Zone, as provided in Section 27-461(b), are permitted by right in the M-U-I Zone, except as follows:**
  - (1) For the uses in Section 27-461(b)(3), Miscellaneous, and 27-461(b)(6) Residential/Lodging, the uses allowed are those permitted in Section 27-441(b)(4), Miscellaneous, and (7), Residential/Lodging, for the R-18 Zone, except that hotel and motel uses are permitted as in the C-S-C Zone.**

The proposed consolidated storage use is listed under Section 27-461(b)(3), Miscellaneous, of the Zoning Ordinance, which then defaults to Section 27-441(b)(4), Miscellaneous, of the Zoning Ordinance, which does not list consolidated storage. Therefore, as stated in Section 27-441(a)(7), all uses not listed are prohibited. Pursuant to Section 27-548.26(b) of the Zoning Ordinance, the applicant can request that the Prince George's County District Council change the list of allowed uses for the subject property to allow the consolidated storage use. In so doing, the Council must find that the proposed development conforms with the purposes and recommendations for the Development District, as stated in the Master Plan, Master Plan Amendment, or Sector Plan, meets applicable site plan requirements, and does not otherwise substantially impair the implementation of any comprehensive plan applicable to the subject development proposal.

In the public hearing for this application on January 23, 2020, the Planning Board took no position on the proposed consolidated storage use.

### **REQUESTED AMENDMENTS TO DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT STANDARDS**

In accordance with Section 27-548.25 of the Zoning Ordinance, in approving the DSP, 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.

The applicant has requested two amendments which warrant discussion, as follows (all page numbers reference the Sector Plan):

a. **Mixed-Use Transition, Table 8.9, Mixed-Use Transition Area Bulk Table (pg. 158)**

**The maximum building height is four stories.**

The applicant is requesting a modification to the maximum building height for the site to allow a seven-story building, which includes four stories above grade and three stories partially below grade. The Planning Board finds that the building design as proposed is acceptable because of the unique steep slopes in the eastern end of the property and that the additional height will not substantially impair the Master Plan. Therefore, the Planning Board **approves** this request.

b. **Mixed-Use Transition, Table 8.9 Mixed-Use Transition Area Bulk Table (pg. 158)**

**The minimum ground-floor height for a building with non-residential uses or buildings on a corner lot is 12 feet.**

The west building elevation as originally submitted showed the ground-floor height to be 10 feet, 8 inches. However, in the revised architecture presented at the Planning Board hearing, the ground-floor height was shown to be raised to the minimum as required by the standard. Therefore, an amendment is not needed.

c. **Mixed-Use Transition, Parking and access management (pg. 161)**

**5.b. For commercial uses, the minimum required on-site parking capacity shall be 50 percent of the current required minimum capacity as determined in Section 27-568(a). The permitted maximum on-site capacity shall be equal to 100% of the minimum capacity required by Section 27-568(a).**

The applicant is requesting a modification to the minimum required parking spaces for the site. The DSP is proposing 12 parking spaces, which is below the minimum required 17 parking spaces for this use. To justify this five-space parking deficit, the applicant has

referenced the *Parking Generation Manual 5th Edition* (Institute of Transportation Engineers).

The manual has indicated that for storage facilities, such as the one proposed, at most no more than 12 parking spaces are generally required during the peak periods of both weekdays and weekends. Therefore, the Planning Board **approves** this request.

d. **Mixed-Use Transition, Building design guidelines (pg. 163)**

- 3.a. **Building designs shall use materials with high aesthetic character, such as brick, decorative masonry, decorative metals, and decorative wood, to be determined through the design review process.**
- 3.b. **Low-quality materials, such as concrete masonry units, exterior insulating finishing system, or prefabricated panels, shall be minimized and masked wherever possible.**

Given that this is one of the first new developments in this area of the Sector Plan, to benefit the development district it is important that the building materials represent a high aesthetic character to establish a precedence. The originally submitted building elevations were revised by Applicant's Exhibit #1, as well as shown in other applicant exhibits, to reduce EIFS as the dominate material on all facades of the building. Therefore, an amendment is no longer required.

e. **Public Realm Standards, Signage, Building and Canopy Signs (pg. 181)**

- 1.h. **Lit signs should be externally illuminated from the front, except for individually mounted letters or numbers, which may be internally lit. Panelized back lighting and box signs are discouraged.**

The applicant requested modification to the building and canopy signs standard to allow internally lit signs on the building. Panelized back lighting and box signs are discouraged. However, this standard is not mandatory as it is stated as a "should" and not a "shall." The proposed building-mounted signs are individual letters mounted to a raceway, which is in keeping with the guideline.

The Planning Board finds that the alternate standards will not substantially impair implementation of the Central Annapolis Road Sector Plan and SMA. Future development proposals on the subject site should be reevaluated for their ability to conform to the development district standards.

- 8. **Zoning Ordinance:** The subject site plan has been reviewed for conformance with the requirements of the M-U-I and D-D-O Zones. The Planning Board's findings regarding these requirements follows:

a. Section 27 546.19(c), Site Plans for Mixed Uses, of the Zoning Ordinance requires that:

(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;**

Section 27-285 of the Zoning Ordinance contains required findings for DSP approval. These required findings are provided under Findings 14 and 15 below.

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

The applicant has requested amendments to allow the consolidated storage use on the property and for other site conditions which have been evaluated for conformance with the requirements of the Central Annapolis Road Sector Plan and SMA. The Planning Board takes no position on the proposed use, but approves the DSP with necessary amendments.

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

The proposed consolidated storage use and accessory offices 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**

The proposed consolidated storage use is compatible with existing development on adjacent properties.

(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;**

The massing of the building as submitted was not compatible to the surrounding buildings, as it presents large blank façades that are viewable from adjacent commercial and residential properties. The applicant presented revised architecture, as shown in multiple exhibits at the hearing, that improved the



massing of the building and the Planning Board finds it will be compatible with 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;**

The primary façades and entries face MD 450, and a public walkway is connected to the street so as to avoid crossing the parking lot and driveway.

- (C) Site design should minimize glare, light, and other visual intrusions into and impacts on yards, open areas, and building facades on adjacent properties;**

A photometric plan was not provided and should be in order to determine light intrusion onto adjacent properties.

- (D) Building materials and color should be like 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;**

The building materials and colors are similar to those on adjacent properties; however, the building, as originally designed, does not incorporate scaling or detailing to ensure compatibility. Multiple elevations present as a seven-story building with little to no detailing, which is not compatible with the neighborhood. However, the applicant presented revised architecture, as shown in multiple exhibits, that the Planning Board finds to be acceptable as it included more architectural detailing that enhanced the compatibility.

- (E) Outdoor storage areas and mechanical equipment should be located and screened to minimize visibility from adjacent properties and public streets;**

The DSP does not show any outdoor storage areas or mechanical equipment.

- (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**

The proposed signage conforms to the applicable development district standards.

**(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.**

The applicant clarified that an employee will be on site in the office between 9:30 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Patrons will also have access to their units through a security keypad system between 6:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. The applicant also clarified cameras will be installed inside and outside of the building for security and that the building will be climate controlled. The DSP shows no outdoor trash receptacles or vending machines. The loading spaces are located and screened so as to minimize adverse impacts on adjacent properties. A photometric plan was not provided and should be in order to determine the impacts on the neighborhood.

- b. The applicant has proposed a revised site plan, as shown in exhibits presented before the Planning Board, in accordance with Section 27-283, Site design guidelines, of the Zoning Ordinance that further cross-references the same guidelines as stated in Section 27-274 of the Zoning Ordinance, specifically in regard to parking, loading, internal circulation, and service areas.
- c. The Central Annapolis Road Sector Plan and SMA does not have specific requirements for the number of loading spaces. Therefore, Part 11 of the Zoning Ordinance serves as the requirement; the 133,000-square-foot consolidated storage building requires six loading spaces and this DSP only proposes two. Section 27-548.25(e), Site plan approval for the D-D-O Zone specifically states:

- (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.**

The applicant seeks a departure for the number of loading spaces, a reduction from the six required to two provided. The DSP conforms to all development district standards, including the amendments as discussed in Finding 7 above. Therefore, the Planning Board approves this departure for the reduced number of loading spaces.

9. **Record Plat WWW 38-16:** The property is known as Lot 7, Block E of the Grayling Subdivision, recorded in Plat Book WWW 38-16 on March 3, 1960, and is located on Tax Map 51 in Grid C-2. As this property was platted in March 1960, resubdivision of the property is required, in accordance with Section 24-111(c) of the Subdivision Regulations:

**A final plat of subdivision approved prior to October 27, 1970, shall be subdivided prior to the issuance of a building permit.**

A new final plat of resubdivision has been filed by the applicant, which proposes development consistent with this DSP. The approval and recording of this plat will be required prior to issuance of a building permit.

10. **2010 Prince George's County Landscape Manual:** The development district standards contained in the Central Annapolis Road Sector Plan and SMA modify those contained in the 2010 Prince George's County Landscape Manual (page 182). The submitted DSP is in conformance with the applicable D-D-O standards relative to landscaping. The D-D-O standards reference Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, as the requirement for a bufferyard and the DSP demonstrates compliance along the rear of the property where it adjoins multifamily dwellings.
11. **Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation:** This site is subject to the provisions of the 2010 Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance (WCO) because the property is greater than 40,000 square feet in area and proposes to clear more than 5,000 square feet of woodland. A Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan (TCP2-034-2019) was submitted concurrently with the DSP application.

The site has an overall woodland conservation threshold of 15 percent or 0.16 acre. A total of 0.47 acre of woodlands are proposed to be cleared with this application, resulting in a woodland conservation requirement of 0.57 acre for this development. The calculation provided on the TCP2 is incorrect and there are other technical revisions to the TCP2 plan that are conditioned herein.

The TCP2 proposed to meet the woodland conservation requirement for the site through off-site woodland conservation credits. The correct amount of off-site woodland conservation credits required is 0.57 acre. All off-site woodland conservation credits required by the approved TCP2

must be acquired from an approved off-site woodland conservation bank prior to issuance of the first grading permit. The location of off-site woodland conservation requirements shall be in accordance with the priorities listed in Section 24-122(a)(6): within the same eight-digit sub-watershed (Cabin Branch), within the same watershed (Western Branch), within the same river basin (Patuxent), within the same growth policy tier (Developing), or within Prince George's County. Applicants shall demonstrate to the Planning Director or designee due diligence in seeking out appropriate locational opportunities for off-site woodland.

12. **Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance:** Subtitle 25, Division 3, the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance, requires a minimum percentage of tree canopy coverage on projects that propose more than 5,000 square feet of disturbance. Properties zoned M-U-I are required to provide a minimum of 10 percent of the gross tract area to be covered by tree canopy. The subject site is 1.094 acres in size and requires 4,765 square feet of tree canopy coverage. The subject DSP provides the required schedule showing the requirement will be met through the provision of proposed plantings.

13. **Further Planning Board Findings and Comments from Other Entities:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments were reviewed by the Board and are summarized as follows:

- a. **Community Planning**—The Planning Board reviewed a memorandum dated December 16, 2019 (White to Hurlbutt), which offered an in-depth discussion of the DSP's conformance with the D-D-O. It is adopted herein by reference, except as modified in the findings above.
- b. **Transportation Planning**—The Planning Board adopts, herein by reference, except as modified in findings above, a memorandum dated December 6, 2019 (Burton to Hurlbutt), which provided comment on conformance to the applicable D-D-O standards. In addition, circulation within the site is found to be adequate. The property fronts on MD 450, which is a six-lane arterial road (A-18). Because the road is currently built to its ultimate master plan cross section, no further widening is anticipated and consequently, no additional right-of-way is required. Despite a single access point for both ingress and egress, there is ample space for cars and small vans to turn around within the confines of the parking area of the site. The Planning Board finds circulation within the site to be adequate and the site's access, frontage, parking, and on-site vehicular and pedestrian circulation patterns are acceptable.
- c. **Trails**—The Planning Board adopts, herein by reference, a memorandum dated December 10, 2019 (Smith to Hurlbutt), which provided analysis of the DSP, summarized as follows:

The proposed development includes a standard sidewalk along the site's entire frontage of MD 450 and a sidewalk connecting the proposed building with the public right-of-way. Crosswalks and pedestrian signals also exist at the intersection of MD 450 and the site's entrance at 68th Avenue. The property is served by the Washington

Metropolitan Area Transit Authority bus routes, with a bus stop in the vicinity of the subject site.

The concurrent Final Plat Application (5-19004) is subject to the requirements of Section 24-124.01 of the Subdivision Regulations (bike/pedestrian adequacy). A bus shelter along Annapolis Road was identified as a potential improvement at the bicycle and pedestrian impact statement scoping meeting, on November 12, 2019. The Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) Office of Transit has recommended that the stop be made shelter ready and that the applicant work with DPW&T's contractor regarding the shelter installation. Prior to signature approval, an exhibit showing the location, limits, and details shall be submitted.

The site is identified within a multiway boulevard section of the Annapolis Road corridor per the Central Annapolis Road Sector Plan and SMA, which includes specific streetscape recommendations that impacts the site's frontage, as illustrated in Figure 8.29d in the Sector Plan.

The appropriate 120-foot right-of way dedication is shown on the submitted plans. As shown in Figure 8.29d, additional improvements beyond the public right-of-way are planned along the corridor. An exhibit submitted by the applicant demonstrates that the development proposed on the subject site does not preclude the ultimate implementation of the multiway boulevard by the operating agency as proposed in the master plan.

- d. **Environmental Planning**—The Planning Board adopts, herein by reference, a memorandum dated December 09, 2019 (Finch to Hurlbutt), the which provided the following summarized comments:

**Natural Resources Inventory/Existing Conditions Plan**

An approved Natural Resources Inventory, NRI-073-2019, was submitted with the application. There is no primary management area located on-site. The forest stand delineation indicates the presence of one forest stand totaling 0.47 acre with a low priority for preservation or restoration. Two specimen trees are identified on the NRI off-site but with critical root zones (CRZ), which extend onto the subject property. Specimen Tree 2 is a 33-inch diameter at breast height cottonwood (*Populus deltoides*) in fair condition, which will have approximately 30 percent of its CRZ impacted by grading and the placement of a retaining wall.

**Stormwater Management**

The site has an approved Stormwater Management Concept Letter 18998-2019-0 and associated plan that is in conformance with the current code and valid until July 28, 2022. The plan shows the use of two underground detention facilities to treat 100 percent of the water quality volume and channel protection volume for new impervious area using environmental site design practices and techniques before it leaves the site. The approved concept plan is consistent with the TCP2.

### **Soils**

The predominant soils found to occur on-site, according to the United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service, Web Soil Survey, include Russet-Christiana-Urban land complex, Urban land-Christiana-Downer complex, Urban land Russett-Christiana complex and Christiana-Downer-Urban land complex.

According to available information, no Marlboro clay is in the vicinity of this site, but soils containing Christiana complexes are mapped on this property. The Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE) may require a soils report to address on-site conditions prior to issuance of a grading and/or building permits.

- e. **Subdivision Review**—The Planning Board adopts, herein by reference, a memorandum dated December 5, 2019 (Simon to Hurlbutt), which provided comment on the subject DSP, as incorporated in Finding 9 above.
- f. **Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE)**— The Planning Board adopts, herein by reference, a memorandum dated November 22, 2019 (Giles to Hurlbutt), in which DPIE provided comments on the subject application that will be addressed through DPIE's separate permitting process.
- g. **Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA)**— The Planning Board adopts, herein by reference, a memorandum submitted on December 2, 2019, in which SHA indicated that they had no objection to the subject application.
- h. **Prince George's County Police Department**—The Police Department did not provide any comments on the subject application.
- i. **Prince George's County Health Department**—The Health Department did not provide any comments on the subject application.
- j. **Fire/EMS Department**—The Fire/EMS Department did not provide any comments on the subject application.
- k. **Landover Hills**—The Mayor of Landover Hills provided testimony at the public hearing in support of the proposed development.
- l. **Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)**— The Planning Board adopts, herein by reference, an email dated November 11, 2019 (Burnham to Hurlbutt), in which WSSC offered numerous comments on the subject application that have been provided to the applicant. A critical comment with regard to the building setback was addressed by the applicant. The other comments will be addressed through WSSC separate permitting process.

14. Based on the foregoing and as required by Section 27-285(b)(1), the DSP, if revised as conditioned, 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.
15. 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.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Subtitle 27 of the Prince George's County Code, the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission adopts the findings contained herein and:

- A. Recommends to the District Council NO POSITION on the property owner's request to permit a consolidated storage use on the subject site.
- B. APPROVES of the following alternative development district standards:
  1. **Mixed-Use Transition, Parking and access management, Standard 5.b. (page 161):** To allow a reduction of 5 required parking spaces, to allow only 12 parking spaces.
  2. **Mixed-Use Transition, Table 8.9, Mixed-Use Transition Area Bulk Table (page 158):** To allow a maximum 7-story building.
- C. APPROVES of Detailed Site Plan DSP-19001 and Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan TCP2-034-2019 for JSF Annapolis Road, including a departure from the required number of loading spaces, subject to the following conditions:
  1. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, the plans shall be revised, as follows:
    - a. Revise the site plan and architectural elevations to incorporate the changes as demonstrated in Applicant's Exhibit #1.
    - b. Revise the site plan to provide a more prominent connection to the sidewalk within the MD 450 right-of-way.
    - c. Demonstrate that the amount of exterior insulating finishing system on each building façade does not exceed fifty percent, to be reviewed and approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.
    - d. Provide faux windows and bays with consistent fenestration, on all of the upper levels of all sides of the building to break it up as viewed from a distance and provide a sense of engagement consistent with Applicant's Exhibit #1.

- e. Provide additional landscaping along the north and south elevations to screen the building and break up the elevations.
  - f. Submit a bicycle pedestrian impact statement exhibit showing the location, limits, specifications, and details of off-site bus stop improvements meeting the requirements of Section 24-124.01 of the Subdivision Regulations.
  - g. Provide art, building tattoo, or super graphic on the upper three stories of the east elevation, to be reviewed and approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.
2. Prior to certification of the DSP, the TCP2 shall be revised, as follows:
- a. The woodland conservation worksheet shall be revised to:
    - (1) Provide the correct name for the project.
    - (2) Calculate the correct requirement for the site.
    - (3) Indicate how the full requirement is being satisfied.
  - b. An Invasive Species Management Plan in the standard template format required by the Environmental Planning Section shall be included on the plan.
  - c. The location of root pruning associated with impacts to specimen tree ST-1 and 2 shall be clearly shown on the plan.
  - d. The graphic for steep slopes shall be removed from the plan and legend.
  - e. The graphic for the proposed tree line shall be removed from the plan and legend. The limit of disturbance shall be used to indicate the limits of clearing.
  - f. Conceptual stormwater methods and facilities shall be labeled on the plan.
  - g. The location of temporary tree protection device, to protect trees on adjacent sites, shall be completely shown.
  - h. A detail for the temporary tree protection device shall be provided on the plan.
  - i. A detail for tree protection construction signage shall be provided on the plan.
  - j. The following standard TCP2 notes shall be revised or included, as indicated below:



- (1) Remove the second sentence from Note 1.
  - (2) In Note 3, indicate the pre-construction meeting shall be held with the Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement.
  - (3) Add notes for "When off-site woodland conservation is proposed."
  - (4) Add note for "When invasive plant species are to be removed by the permittee."
- k. After all revisions are made, the revised plan shall be signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared it, as defined by the Maryland Department of Natural Resources. A professional engineer is not qualified to sign the plan unless they are also credentialed by the state.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that an appeal of the Planning Board's action must be filed with the District Council of Prince George's County within thirty (30) days following the final notice of the Planning Board's decision.

\* \* \* \* \*

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the action taken by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner Washington, seconded by Commissioner Doerner, with Commissioners Washington, Doerner, Bailey, Geraldo and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, January 23, 2020, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 13th day of February 2020.

Elizabeth M. Hewlett  
Chairman

By Jessica Jones  
Planning Board Administrator

EMH:JJ:JH:nz