

RESOLUTION

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 September 9, 2004 regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-03085 for Walker Mill Business Park, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The subject application requests a contractor's storage yard with three buildings in the I-1 Zone.
2. **Development Data Summary**

	<b>EXISTING</b>	<b>PROPOSED</b>
Zone	I-1	I-1
Use(s)	Vacant	Contractor's Offices, Shop and Storage Yard
Acreage	1.7399	1.7399
Lots	1	1
Building Square Footage/GFA	0	16,050

OTHER DEVELOPMENT DATA

	<b>REQUIRED</b>	<b>PROPOSED</b>
Total parking spaces	33	33
Loading spaces	2	2

3. **Location:** The site is in Planning Area 75B, Council District 7. More specifically, it is located in the southwest quadrant of the intersection of Rochell Avenue and Hazelwood Drive.
4. **Surroundings and Use:** The subject property is flanked to the west by a contractor's storage yard, also a part of Walker Mill Business Park, to the south by existing woodlands and a vacant parcel, also a part of Walker Mill Business Park. A second vacant parcel, also a part of Walker Mill Business Park, is located directly across Hazelwood Drive, to the east of the subject site. A third vacant parcel, controlled by the Woodward Industrial Park, is located directly across Rochell Avenue to the northeast, and another contractor's storage yard is located to its west on the northerly side of Rochell Avenue. Industrial warehouses are located diagonally across the street from the subject site across the intersection of Hazelwood Drive and Rochelle Avenue.
5. **Previous Approvals:** A Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (4-01056) was approved for the subject property on September 27, 2001. The Planning Board adopted resolution 01-198 formalizing that approval on October 18, 2001, and the resolution was mailed out on October 23, 2001. A

Stormwater Management Concept Approval (#5930-2004) was approved by the Department of Environmental Resources on March 7, 2004.

6. **Design Features:** The design for the site includes three buildings accessed from a single access point off of Rochell Avenue. Proposed Building “A”, a 7,875 square foot and 20 feet-tall building, is located along the southernmost boundary of the site. Proposed Building “B” sits on the northeasterly frontage of the subject property along Rochell Avenue. Building “B” is proposed to measure 1,975 square feet and be 20 feet high. Proposed Building “C”, a 6,200 square foot building also 20 feet tall, is located toward the Rochell Avenue frontage of the property but along its northwesterly boundary. A 25-foot-wide landscape strip is located along the Rochell Avenue frontage of the subject property and along the property’s Hazelwood Drive frontage. A proposed 12-foot square concrete dumpster pad with batten board fencing sits in the extreme southwest corner of the site. A proposed six-foot-high batten board fence surrounds the property. A four-foot sidewalk is provided along both the Rochell Avenue and the Hazelwood Drive frontages. The center of the property provides a proposed contractor’s storage/operating area. Parking is provided adjacent to the individual buildings. The building elevations show uniform treatment in 26-gauge painted galvalume panels with utilitarian standard and overhead doors punctuating the facades. Due to the berming, fencing, landscaping of the peripheries and the topography of the area, the buildings will be minimally visible from eye level on the streets immediately adjacent to the subject property.

#### COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **Zoning Ordinance:** The subject application has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements in the I-1 Zone and the site plan design guidelines of the Zoning Ordinance.
  - a. The subject application is in conformance with the requirements of Section 27-473, which governs permitted uses in industrial zones. The proposed contractor’s storage yard is a permitted use in the I-1 Zone.
  - b. The proposal is also in conformance with the requirements of Section 27-474, Regulations, regarding additional regulations for development in industrial zones.
8. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, 4-01056:** The Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan 4-01056 on September 27, 2001. Resolution PGCPB 01-198 was adopted on October 18, 2001, formalizing the approval. The following conditions of approval apply to the review of the subject Detailed Site Plan.
  1. **Establishes that the total development within Lots 15, 16, 17, and 18 of Walker Mill Business Park shall be limited to permitted uses which generate no more than 183 AM and 183 PM peak-hour vehicle trips. Any development generating impact greater than that identified herein shall require a new Preliminary Plan of Subdivision with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities.**

Comment: The Transportation Planning Section has stated in its referral response to the subject project that the proposed project is well within the cap set for the entire subdivision.

**3. Requires that the DSP review shall be required prior to the issuance of building permits pursuant to CR-147-1985. The following shall be included in the review or the specified information shall be supplied:**

**a. The Planning Board shall review the development to assure its compliance with the following design guidelines:**

- (1) An effective visual buffer created by substantial berms and landscaping shall be provided along Walker Mill Road, Rollins Avenue, and Addison Road and along abutting areas which are planned or developed for residential purposes in order to maintain the residential character of surrounding properties.**

The subject project is not located on Walker Mill Road, Rollins Avenue, or Addison Road, nor is it located along abutting areas that are planned or developed for residential purposes. Therefore, the above design guideline does not apply. Staff would like to note, however, that the applicant is providing a 25-foot landscaped strip together with a 6-foot high batten board fence set 25-feet back from the property line along both the Hazelwood Drive and Rochell Avenue road frontages.

**(2) The internal organization of the site shall address the following:**

- A. Provide a continuous six-foot high sight-tight wood fence with swinging or sliding gates along property lines, which have frontage on any vehicular right-of-way within the subdivision. Metal security fencing, including chain link, may be located behind and adjacent to the required wood fence if it is not visible from the street.**

As mentioned in 3(a)(1) above, the applicant has provided a six-foot-high sight-tight fence along both the Rochell Avenue and Hazelwood Drive frontages. In addition, the applicant has indicated that the proposed gates for the project are designed as swing batten board gates, further complying with the requirements of design guideline 3(a)(2).

- B. Provide 12 feet of commercial/industrial-landscaped strip along property lines that have frontage on any vehicular right-of-way. Plant materials provided within the landscaped strip shall be evergreen trees planted 10 feet on**

**center, or other acceptable planting arrangement utilizing the same quantity of trees which is approved by the Planning Board or the Urban Design staff as designee of the Planning Board. White pine trees shall constitute no more than 20 percent of the trees in this landscaped strip.**

The applicant has provided a 25-foot landscaped strip along the property lines that have frontage on a vehicular right-of-way. Plant materials provided within this landscaped strip include two staggered rows of Leyland Cypress, an evergreen tree, planted approximately 15 feet on center and four to five Winged Euonymus shrubs on either side of each gate accessing the subject property. No White Pine has been utilized in the landscaping scheme. Staff is of the opinion that the proposed is an acceptable planting arrangement that fulfills the intent of the condition. The planting scheme provides more than enough plant units to fulfill the requirements of Section 4.2 of the *Landscape Manual*.

**C. Provide cross-sections through the subject site to demonstrate that any area of outdoor storage visible from any adjacent right-of-way shall have the solid wood fence specified in condition 1.a.**

Applicant has provided cross sections of the site indicating that lines of sight from the street, due to the set back and height of the fence and landscaping to be installed, make only the upper portions of the buildings at all visible from any adjacent right-of-way.

Comment: Staff has reviewed the subject project against the above design requirements and found it in general conformance.

**5. Requires that prior to issuance of any permit, a Type II TCP shall be submitted that is in conformance with the Type I TCP and designates the location of the 2.83 acres of off-site mitigation. Priority shall be given to the location of the off-site mitigation within the Anacostia watershed.**

Comment: The Environmental Section has reviewed the Type II TCP application, found it in conformance with all requirements and conditions and recommended approval subject to the condition contained in the recommended conditions section below.

9. ***Landscape Manual:*** Section 4.2, Commercial and Industrial Landscaped Strip, applies to the project. The Urban Design staff reviewed the proposed Landscape Plan and found it to be in general compliance with the applicable sections of the *Landscape Manual*.

10. **Woodland Conservation Ordinance:** The property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because it is more than 40,000 square feet in size and contains more than 10,000 square feet of woodland. The Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCP II/65/04, as submitted is in conformance with the approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCP1/20/01) of which the subject property is a part. The plan shows the requirement being met with zero acres of on-site preservation; however, the wrong woodland conservation worksheet was used. A revised Type II Tree Conservation Plan is required to reflect the correct worksheet in compliance with the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance.

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

a. **Historic Preservation**—At the time of the writing of this staff report, the Historic Preservation Planning Section has not offered comment on the proposed project.

b. **Community Planning**—The Community Planning Division, in a memorandum dated June 18, 2004, noting that the Suitland-District Heights & Vicinity Master Plan recommends employment and light industrial development for the subject I-1-zoned site, stated the following:

“The 1985 *Suitland-District Heights & Vicinity Master Plan* shows this tract of land as part of an extensive employment area extending from Rollins Avenue to Walker Mill Road. In approving the master plan, (CR-147-1985) the District Council included recommendations that specifically relate to the Walker Mill Business as a whole. Applicable design guidelines include:

(1) An effective visual buffer created by substantial berms and landscaping shall be provided along Walker Mill Road, Rollins Avenue, and Addison Road, and along abutting areas which are planned or developed for residential purposes in order to maintain the residential character of surrounding properties.

(2) The internal organization of the site shall address the following:

(a.) Minimizing the views of parking, loading, storage and service areas.

**Comment:** View of parking, loading, storage and service areas have been minimized by the installation of a six-foot fence and 25-foot landscaped buffer on both road frontages.

(b.) Providing architectural elevations consistent in materials and treatment on all sides, and with all mechanical equipment enclosed or screened. The screening and enclosures shall be treated as integral elements of building design.

**Comment:** The submitted architectural elevations indicate consistency on all building sides and no obvious mechanical equipment. The project is screened at its periphery as described above.

- (c.) Signs shall not be placed above the roof or parapet line. No moving or flashing signs, or signs projecting significantly from a building, shall be permitted. Low ground-mounted and landscaped signs in keeping with the scale of the buildings and the site shall be encouraged in lieu of building mounted signs.”

**Comment:** No signs have been included with the subject application.

Staff has reviewed the subject application and found it to be in general conformance with the requirements of the master plan.

- c. **Transportation**—In a memorandum dated August 25, 2004, the Transportation Planning Section stated that the site plan is acceptable from the standpoint of access and circulation. Further, they stated that Conditions 9 and 10 of the resolution approving Preliminary Plan 4-02056 were inapplicable to the subject site, as it has no frontage on Walker Mill Road. Condition 1 of the same resolution, however, applies to the subject property, among others, and establishes a trip cap. The Transportation Planning Section has stated that the proposed project is well within the cap set for the entire subdivision. In addition, Condition 2 of the preliminary plan resolution references certain road improvements prior to the issuance of any building permits for the subject project. The Transportation Planning Section stated that the applicant must ensure that all improvements are appropriately constructed or guaranteed prior to that time. Lastly, the Transportation Planning Section has determined that the submitted site plan is consistent with the transportation-related conditions and/or findings that were placed on the property pursuant to a finding of adequate transportation facilities.
- d. **Subdivision**—In a memorandum, dated June 21, 2004, the Subdivision Section stated that certain conditions of the approving resolution for Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-01056 for Walker Mill Business Park, PGCPB Resolution 01-198, adopted on October 18, 2001, apply to the proposed project. Following are the conditions cited by the Subdivision Section as applicable and comments regarding each condition by the Subdivision Section:

**Condition 1** Establishes that the total development within Lots 15, 16, 17, and 18 of Walker Mill Business Park shall be limited to permitted uses which generate no more than 183 AM and 183 PM peak-hour vehicle trips. Any development generating impact greater than that identified herein shall require a new Preliminary Plan of Subdivision with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities.

**Comment:** The Transportation Planning Section should determine conformance.

**Condition 3** Requires that the DSP review shall be required prior to the issuance of building permits pursuant to CR-147-1985. The following shall be included in the review or the specified information shall be supplied:

- a. The Planning Board shall review the development to assure its compliance with the following design guidelines:
  - (1) An effective visual buffer created by substantial berms and landscaping shall be provided along Walker Mill Road, Rollins Avenue, and Addison Road and along abutting areas which are planned or developed for residential purposes in order to maintain the residential character of surrounding properties.
  - (2) The internal organization of the site shall address the following:
    - A. Provide a continuous six-foot high sight-tight wood fence with swinging or sliding gates along property lines, which have frontage on any vehicular right-of-way within the subdivision. Metal security fencing, including chain link, may be located behind and adjacent to the required wood fence if it is not visible from the street.
    - B. Provide 12 feet of commercial/industrial-landscaped strip along property lines that have frontage on any vehicular right-of-way. Plant materials provided within the landscaped strip shall be evergreen trees planted 10 feet on center, or other acceptable planting arrangement utilizing the same quantity of trees that is approved by the Planning Board or the Urban Design staff as designee of the Planning Board. White pine trees shall constitute no more than 20 percent of the trees in this landscaped strip.
    - C. Provide cross-sections through the subject site to demonstrate that any area of outdoor storage visible from any adjacent right-of-way shall have the solid wood fence specified in Condition 1.a.

**Comment:** This condition applies to the review of this DSP. An analysis of these requirements is contained in Finding 8 of this staff report.

**Condition 5** Requires that prior to issuance of any permit, a Type II TCP shall be submitted that is in conformance with the Type I TCP and designates the location of the 2.83 acres of off-site mitigation. Priority shall be given to the location of the off-site mitigation within the Anacostia watershed.

**Comment:** The Type II Tree Conservation Plan should be evaluated with the review of the DSP.

The Subdivision Section also stated that at the time of review of the preliminary plan of subdivision, the Community Planning Division noted the Planning Board's determination, given the concerns stated by members of the surrounding community, that a comprehensive design approach was necessary for Walker Mill Business Park. Such approach would address items such as fence and gate design, landscaping, and attention to eliminating views of outdoor storage from adjacent travel ways.

- e. **Trails**—In a memorandum dated August 26, 2004, the Senior Trails Planner stated that there are no trail requirements for the subject project. In addition, he stated that there are no master plan trails issues identified in the adopted and approved Suitland-District Heights master plan. Lastly, he stated that the sidewalks reflected on the submitted site plan would accommodate pedestrians along Rochell Avenue and Hazelwood Drive.
- f. **Permits**—The Permit Review Section made several comments regarding the proposed site plan. These comments have either been addressed by revisions to the plans or in the recommended conditions below.
- g. **Public Facilities**—The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section stated that the response times for fire engine, ambulance, paramedic and ladder truck service were all acceptable and in conformance with the *Adopted and Approved Public Safety Master Plan 1990* and the *Guidelines for the Analysis of Development Impact on Fire and Rescue Facilities*. Additionally, the Section stated that the proposed development would be adequately served by the Police District III in Landover. This response was for informational purposes only, as there is no required finding of adequacy of public facilities in connection with a detailed site plan.
- h. **Environmental Planning**—In a memorandum dated June 15, 2004, the Environmental Planning Section offered the following:

#### **Environmental Review**

Forest Stand Delineation has been submitted for this site and was generally found to address the requirements for Detailed Forest Stand Delineation in compliance with the Woodland Conservation Ordinances. The Forest Stand Delineation reviewed covered a larger area totaling 15.99 acres in compliance with TCPI/20/01.

*Discussion: No further information or action is required with regard to the Detailed Site Plan.*

This property is subject to the provisions of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance because it is more than 40,000 square feet in size and contains more than 10,000 square feet of woodland. The Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/65/04, as submitted is in conformance with the approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCP1/20/01) of which the subject property is a part. The plan shows the requirement being met with zero acres of on-site preservation; however, the wrong woodland conservation worksheet was used. A revised Type II Tree Conservation Plan is required to reflect the correct worksheet in compliance with the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance. The required worksheet and computation are attached with this memorandum.

*Recommended Condition: Prior to certificate approval of the Detailed Site Plan, the TCPII shall be revised to include the correct worksheet in conformance with the Type I TCP and Woodland Conservation Ordinance.*

A condition contained in an earlier Planning Board Resolution for Walker Mill Business Park states “A methane study is recommended to ensure that the land is safe for development.” This study has been reviewed by staff, which indicates there is no presence of methane gas in the area.

*Discussion: No further testing or review related to this issue is necessary at this time.*

A Stormwater Management Concept Approval Letter (CSD#5930-2004-00) dated March 7, 2004, was submitted with the review package. The requirements for stormwater management will be met through subsequent reviews by the Department of Environmental Resources.

*Comment: No further information is required at this time with regard to stormwater management.*

- i. **The Department of Environmental Resources**—In comments offered June 7, 2004, the Department of Environmental Resources stated that the site plan for Walker Mill Business Park, DSP-03085, is not consistent with approved stormwater concept #5930-2004 because it does not show the proposed underground stormfilter system.
- j. **The Prince George’s County Fire Department**—At the time of the writing of this staff report, the Prince George’s County Fire Department has not commented on the proposed project.
- k. **The Department of Public Works and Transportation**—In a memorandum dated June 21, 2004, the Department of Public Works and Transportation offered comment on the proposed project. The Department of Public Works and Transportation’s concerns will be addressed through its separate permitting procedure.

1. **The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission**—In a memorandum dated June 10, 2004, the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission stated that water and sewer are available to the site and that an onsite plan review package should be submitted.
12. As required by Section 27-285(b) of the Zoning Ordinance, the Detailed Site Plan represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines of Subtitle 27, Part 3, Division 9 of the Prince George's County Code without requiring unreasonable cost and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

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 adopted the findings contained herein and APPROVED the Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII/65/04) and further APPROVED Detailed Site Plan DSP-03085 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan:
  - a. A copy of a revised stormwater management concept approval letter shall be submitted, or the plan shall be revised to show all elements on the current concept approval letter.
  - b. A note should be added to the site plan stating that the site is not located within 300 feet of any residentially-zoned land and land owned by WMATA.
  - c. The TCPII shall be revised to include the correct worksheet in conformance with the Type I TCP and Woodland Conservation Ordinance.

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 Eley, seconded by Commissioner Harley, with Commissioners Eley, Harley, Squire, Vaughns and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, September 9, 2004, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 30<sup>th</sup> day of September 2004.

Trudye Morgan Johnson  
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin  
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:RG:rmk