

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 October 10, 2005 regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-05044 for Steeplechase 95 Business Park, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The subject application requests the construction of 42,414 square-feet of retail space consisting of one bank, one drug store, one service station and one multi-tenant building and 21,800 square feet of restaurant space consisting of two fast-food restaurants and two sit-down restaurants in the retail portion of the Steeplechase 95 Flex Industrial Park in the I-1 Zone. The current application does not include the architectural elevations of the buildings and will be submitted for staff review at a later date.

2. **Development Data Summary**

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone	I-1	I-1
Use(s)	Vacant	Retail portion of a Flex Industrial Park
Acreage	33.04	33.04
Lots	Parcels 26, 27	Lots 14-19, 24, 25
Building Square Footage/GFA	N/A	64,214

OTHER DEVELOPMENT DATA

	REQUIRED	PROPOSED
Total parking spaces	405	577
of which handicapped spaces	27	26
Loading spaces	9	9

3. **Location:** The site is in Planning Area 75A, Council District 6. More specifically, it is located at the intersection of I-495 and Ritchie Marlboro Road.
4. **Surroundings and Use:** The subject property is bounded to the north by a Pepco right-of-way with utility power lines, to the west by the 85,683-square-foot Special Education Center of the Prince George's County Board of Education, to the south by Ritchie Marlboro Road and various industrial/warehouse buildings, and to the east by the Capital Beltway interstate highways I-95/I-495.

5. **Previous Approvals:** The site has also been the subject of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (4-03113) and Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/34/00) , approved by the Planning Board on March 4, 2004, and formalized in PGCPB Resolution No. 04-49. Lastly, the site is the subject of approved stormwater concept plan 8004290-200-03, approved April 11, 2005, and effective for three years or until April 19, 2008.
6. **Design Features:** The intent of the retail portion of the flex office/warehouse development is to create a recognizable image as a distinct place; varying massing to provide visual interest, as applicable, ensure compatibility with surrounding developments, and use building height and massing to emphasize important corners, designated points of entry, and create a visible skyline to differentiate Prince George's new flex office/warehouse areas from other activity nodes.

The 33.04-acre site is accessed from Steeplechase Court that leads into the property from Hampton Park Boulevard to a portion of the development dedicated to retail pad sites that will include banks, restaurants (fast-food and sit-down restaurants) and service retail that ranges from 3,100 square feet to 19,122 square feet. Each building will provide both visitor and employee parking along with service areas.

The office/warehouse development integrates existing natural features and open space into the overall design and layout of the development. Existing natural features and common open spaces are sufficiently used to create site amenities and provide physical separators and buffers from adjacent development. The number, location and design of the independent pad sites reinforce the identity and function of the retail portion of the flex office/warehouse development. The primary facades of all the buildings, typically the facade containing the primary customer entrance, are oriented in a variety of ways that include toward the primary access street, toward a "focal point" of the retail portion and clustered to define street edges and entries.

Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a detailed site plan of the individual pad sites of the retail portion of the office/warehouse design will achieve through the staff level review a unity of design through compatible materials and colors throughout the development; selected building materials that are durable, attractive and have low-maintenance requirements; and will utilize colors that reflect natural tones found in the environment of Prince George's County. The buildings must be constructed and clad with materials that are durable, economically maintained, and of a quality that will retain their appearance over time, including brick, EIFS, painted metal and glass.

A signage package has been submitted for the retail portion of the development. The signage is scaled appropriately to appeal to both pedestrians walking on the adjacent sidewalks and to vehicles driving at reduced speeds. The signs are aesthetically pleasing and cohesive. The signage on the street frontages are integrated into the overall design of the buildings.

The landscaping is designed to visually tie the entire development together, define major entryways and circulation (both vehicular and pedestrian) and parking/loading patterns, and have created buffers at less intensive adjacent land uses.

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.
 - 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 4-03113:** Preliminary Plan (4-03113), approved by the Planning Board on March 4, 2004. Resolution PGCPB No. 04-49 adopted by the Planning Board formalized that approval. Conditions 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 11 of approval apply to the review of the subject detailed site plan. Please see further discussion of those conditions under Finding 11, Referrals, below.
9. **Landscape Manual:** The proposed development is subject to the requirements of Section 4.2, Commercial and Industrial Landscaped Strip, and Section 4.3, Parking Lot Requirements, of the *Landscape Manual*.

The Urban Design staff reviewed the proposed landscape plan and found that the submittals are in general compliance with the applicable sections of the *Landscape Manual*.

10. **Woodland Conservation Ordinance:** The project is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because the gross tract area is greater than 40,000 square feet and there are more than 10,000 square feet of existing woodland on-site.
11. **Referral Comments:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:

Historic Preservation— In a memorandum dated August 15, 2005, the Historic Preservation Planning Section stated that the proposed project would have no effects on historic resources.

Archeology—In a memorandum dated August 15, 2005, M-NCPPC staff stated that a Phase I archeological survey is recommended by the Planning Department on the above-referenced property. The 1861 Martenet map shows the residence of Albert B. Berry (no longer standing) just to the northwest of the property, and P. Hill, Jr., to the west of the property (no longer standing). Both owned slaves. Also, there are two prehistoric archeological sites just to the southeast of the property (Sites 18PR401 and 18PR402).

Phase I archeological investigations should be conducted according to Maryland Historical Trust (MHT) guidelines, *Standards and Guidelines for Archeological Investigations in Maryland*

(Shaffer and Cole 1994) and report preparation should follow MHT guidelines and the *American Antiquity* or *Society of Historical Archaeology* style guide. Archeological excavations shall be spaced along a regular 15-meter or 50-foot grid and excavations should be clearly identified on a map to be submitted as part of the report. Shovel test pits should be augmented with borings to search for possible graves.

Community Planning—In a memorandum dated August 12, 2005, the Community Planning Division stated that the proposed project is not inconsistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies, and that it is in conformance with the land use recommendations of the 1986 *Approved Master Plan and Adopted Sectional Map Amendment for Suitland-District Heights and Vicinity, Planning Areas 75A and 75B*.

This development is at a prominent location. It should adhere to the 2002 General Plan design guidelines for the Developed Tier and the master plan's site design guidelines.

Transportation—In a memorandum dated August 15, 2005, the Transportation Planning Section stated that there is an approved subdivision for the site, Preliminary Plan 4-03113. There are several transportation-related conditions on the underlying subdivision, and the status of these conditions are summarized below:

Preliminary Plan of 4-03113:

Condition 1a(5): Requires denial of access from Lot 25 unless the county Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) indicates that such access “would provide a better transportation design.” Although Lot 25 is not included in this application, the right-in right-out access point is shown on this plan. This driveway access onto an arterial facility was only allowed conditionally by the Planning Board at the time of subdivision. The needed documentation from DPW&T has not been provided. If the applicant can demonstrate that DPW&T believes this access to be superior to having all traffic to Lots 24 and 25 using the Hampton Park Boulevard access, then the access may stay on this plan. Otherwise it must be removed.

As this detailed site plan covers infrastructure, and since the infrastructure for Lot 25 is very much dependent on whatever is approved on Lot 24, it is recommended that the area of this detailed site plan application be expanded to cover Lot 25.

Urban Design Comment: The staff agrees that the applicant should include Lot 25 in the site plan because of the impact imposed on the lot as a result of the ingress/egress of Lot 24.

Condition 6: The required transportation improvements are enforceable at the time of building permit, and this condition will be enforced at that time.

Condition 7: Hampton Park Boulevard is shown with a right-of-way exceeding 70 feet. DPW&T shall determine the scope of improvements to be completed within the right-of-way.

Condition 8: None of the lots east of Hampton Park Boulevard indicate access onto Ritchie Marlboro Road or the Capital Beltway; therefore, this condition is met.

Vehicular and pedestrian access within the site is acceptable. It needs to be stated that the transportation staff is generally averse to the circulation pattern shown without vehicular connections between neighboring commercial lots. Patrons of one commercial establishment should be able to travel to the neighboring establishment on the next lot without driving onto the main highway. A strenuous objection is not raised herein because the adjacent street is not a through roadway, but is a cul-de-sac serving a fixed group of uses. Nonetheless, it is noted that transportation staff would generally prefer to see vehicular connections between Lots 15 and 16, Lots 17 and 18, and Lots 18 and 19, and would support such connections.

The subject property was the subject of a 2003 traffic study and was given subdivision approval pursuant to a finding of adequate transportation facilities made in 2004 for Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03113. Insofar as the uses proposed on this site plan are generally consistent with the uses proposed at the time of preliminary plan, making the basis for the preliminary plan findings is still valid, and in consideration of the materials discussed earlier in this memorandum, the transportation staff finds that the subject property will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with transportation facilities which are existing, programmed, or which will be provided as a part of the development if the development is approved. This determination is conditional upon removal of the access point onto Walker Mill Road shown at Lots 24/25 or provision by the applicant of the required documentation from DPW&T.

Subdivision—In a memorandum dated July 21, 2005, the Subdivision Section offered the following:

The Detailed Site Plan is not consistent with the final record plats. The development appears to include Parcel D and Parcel 20. The bearings and distances, configurations, and acreage, for the lots included in this DSP are not in conformance with the final record plats.

The property is the subject of Preliminary Plan 4-03113, approved by the Planning Board on March 4, 2004. The resolution of approval, PGCPB Resolution 04-49 was adopted on March 11, 2004. The property is the subject of record plats REP 205@93 and REP 205@94. The property is known as Steeple Chase Business Park.

The property is subject to the conditions contained in the resolution of approval (PGCPB Resolution 04-49). That resolution contains eleven conditions. The following conditions relate to the review of the detailed site plan (DSP). Additional comments were provided where appropriate:

- 2. Prior to the issuance of permits, a Type II Tree Conservation Plan shall be approved.**
- 3. Development of this property shall be in conformance to the approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan # 8004290-2000-00.**
- 4. An automatic fire suppression system shall be provided in all new buildings proposed in this subdivision, unless the Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department determines that an alternative method of fire suppression is appropriate.**
- 5. The master plan trail facility along Ritchie Marlboro Road should be continued along the south side of the roadway in the vicinity of the subject site, in keeping with recent DPW&T road improvements in this area. Standard road frontage improvements to the subject site's frontage of Ritchie Marlboro Road (including a standard sidewalk) are recommended at the time of street construction permits, per the concurrence of DPW&T.**
- 6. Ritchie Marlboro Road at site access (aka. Hampton Park Boulevard): Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements shall have full financial assurances, have been permitted for construction, and have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with DPW&T/SHA:**
 - a. Along Ritchie Marlboro Road/Walker Mill Road, provide a westbound right-turn lane and an eastbound left-turn lane.**
 - b. Along Hampton Park Boulevard at the approach to Ritchie Marlboro Road/Walker Mill Road, provide an exclusive right-turn lane and dual left-turn lanes.**
 - c. Provide the necessary traffic signal warrant studies and install a traffic signal at Ritchie Marlboro Road/Hampton Park Boulevard, if warranted, at the time it is deemed necessary by the responsible transportation agency.**
- 8. The final plat shall deny direct access from Lots 14 through 20 onto I-95/I-495, Ritchie Marlboro Road, and ramps connecting these two facilities.**
- 9. Any abandoned well or septic system shall be pumped, backfilled and/or sealed in accordance with COMAR 26.04.04 by a licensed well driller or witnessed by a representative of the Health Department prior to final plat approval.**

10. **The Developed Tier shall be the priority area for all off-site woodland conservation.**
11. **Prior to the approval of a building permit for Lot 4, a limited detailed site plan shall be approved by the Planning Board or its designee. The site plan shall examine architecture and views from the Capital Beltway.**

Record Plats REP 205@93 and REP 205@94 contain eight plat notes; the following apply to the review of the DSP that were not already addressed above.

Development is subject to the restrictions shown on the approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCP/34/00), or as modified by the Type II Tree Conservation Plan, which preclude any disturbance or installation of any structure within specific areas. Failure to comply will mean a violation of an approved Tree Conservation Plan and will make the owner subject to mitigation under the Woodland Conservation/Tree Preservation Policy.

4. **Building permits may not be issued until the planned water and sewer facilities are completed and adequate to serve the proposed development.**
5. **Development of this property must conform to the Preliminary Plan 4-03113, approved on March 11, 2004.**
6. **Issuance of building permits is subject to traffic conditions specified in Prince George's County Planning Board Resolution 04-49.**
7. **Development of this property shall be in conformance to the approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan # 8004-290-2000-00.**
8. **An automatic fire suppression system shall be provided in all new buildings proposed in this subdivision, unless the Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department determines that an alternative method of fire suppression is appropriate.**

There are no other subdivision issues at this time.

Urban Design Comment: The site plan does not match the record plat and will require conformance with the final plats.

Trails—In a memorandum dated November 1, 2005, the senior trails planner stated that the Adopted and Approved 1985 Equestrian Addendum to the Adopted and Approved Countywide Trails Plan and planning work for the update to the Master Plan of Transportation recommend a master plan trail facility along Ritchie-Marlboro Road and Walker Mill Road extended. Bicycle and pedestrian improvements have been incorporated into the recent Ritchie-Marlboro Road and Capital Beltway interchange. These improvements have taken the form of wide and (in places of

right-of-way constraints) standard sidewalks along the south side of Ritchie Marlboro Road.

It appears likely that these improvements will be continued along the south side of Ritchie-Marlboro Road and Walker Mill Road extended. Improvements to the north side of these roads may consist of standard DPW&T improvements, with the master plan trail facility going on the south. Staff recommends that the master plan trail facility along Ritchie-Marlboro Road be continued along the south side of the roadway in the vicinity of the subject site, in keeping with recent DPW&T road improvements in this area.

A master plan trail facility is also recommended within the Pepco right-of-way just north of the subject site. However, due to liability concerns, there are no recommendations regarding this proposal at this time.

SIDEWALK CONNECTIVITY:

Standard sidewalks are reflected along both sides of all internal roads. This includes both sides of the subject application's frontage of Hampton Park Boulevard and Alaking Court.

The senior trails planner's suggestions are included in the recommended conditions below.

Permits—In a memorandum dated July 22, 2005, the Permit Review Section offered numerous comments that have either been addressed by revisions to the plans or in the recommended conditions below.

Environmental Planning—In a memorandum dated October 12, 2005, the Environmental Planning Section offered the following:

The Environmental Planning Section previously reviewed Preliminary Plan 4-00052 for the subject property under the name of Hampton Park, which was withdrawn. The subject property was again reviewed as a Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03113 in conjunction with TCPI/34/00 both of which were approved with conditions. This application seeks the approval of a detailed site plan to establish the construction of both commercial and retail sections, located at the southern portion of the subject property.

Note: As revisions are made to the submitted plans the revision box on each sheet shall be used to describe in detail the revisions made, when and by whom. In the case of Forest Stand Delineations and Tree Conservation Plans, the sheets shall also be signed and dated by the qualified professional preparing the plans.

1. A Forest Stand Delineation (FSD) was submitted with previous applications and was previously reviewed. The 100-year floodplain has changed on the current plans and is now being shown as the proposed floodplain. The FSD will not be required to be revised; however, verification of the 100-year floodplain has not been provided.

2. The property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because the gross tract area is in excess of 40,000 square feet and there are more than 10,000 square feet of existing woodland on-site. Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII/128/90-03) has been reviewed and was found to require revisions.

The current worksheet states that the minimum woodland requirement for the site is 14.67 acres of the net tract. An additional 8.09 acres are required due to the removal of woodlands for a total of 22.76 acres of woodland conservation. The plan shows the requirement being met with 4.72 acres of on-site woodland conservation, 8.69 acres of reforestation and 9.35 acres of off-site mitigation for a total of 22.76 acres in compliance with the requirement of the woodland conservation ordinance. These numbers will change when the required revisions are made to the plans.

The required revisions include the clear depiction of the phases on the cover sheet and a note regarding which phase is associated with each TCPII revision; the elimination of any encroachments into the regulated areas that were not previously approved; the required tree protection fencing and permanent afforestation/reforestation fencing and signage have not been shown; no detail has been provided for the permanent afforestation fencing; on the current phase the proposed building and parking configurations must be shown; and all of the information on the TCPII shall be shown consistently on the DSP.

In addition, the site has already been cleared, and the TCPII shows changes to the preservation areas. A field verification of the current site conditions is needed prior final signature on the TCPII.

The Environmental Planner's suggestions are included in the recommended conditions below.

Department of Environmental Resources—In comments dated August 11, 2005, DER stated that the site plan for Steeplechase 95—DSP-05044, is consistent with approved stormwater concept 15416-2005.

Fire Department—As of the completion date of this staff report, the Specials Operation Command Bureau of Fire Prevention Special Hazards Section had not provided any comments regarding this case.

Department of Public Works & Transportation (DPW&T)—In a memorandum dated September 23, 2005, DPW&T offered the following:

- a. The property is located on the north side of Ritchie Marlboro Road and the west side of the Capital Beltway.
- b. The property bisects the future right-of-way for Hampton Park Boulevard, Master Plan

I-1 (urban commercial/industrial roadway). In addition, the site has frontage on Ritchie-Marlboro Road, Master Plan A-35 (arterial roadway). Concurrence from M-NCPPC and DPW&T following a request from the applicant is necessary.

- c. Full-width, 2-inch mill and overlay for all county roadway frontages is required.
- d. Conformance with DPW&T street tree and street lighting standards is required.
- e. Sidewalks are required along all roadways within the property limits in accordance with Sections 23-105 and 23-135 of the county road ordinance.
- f. All storm drainage systems and facilities are to be in accordance with the requirements of DPW&T and DER.
- g. An access study shall be conducted by the applicant and reviewed to determine the adequacy of access point(s) and the need for acceleration/deceleration and turning lanes.
- h. A soils investigation report that includes engineering evaluation for public streets is required.

Please note the compliance with DPW&T's requirements is enforced through their separate permitting process.

Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)—In comments dated August 11, 2005, WSSC stated that water and sewer extension will be required for the site. In addition, an on-site plan review package should be submitted and an amendment revision to add a pump station and force main to the project is under review. Revise site plan to show those facilities if approved.

- 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.

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/128/90-03) and further APPROVED Detailed Site Plan DSP-05044 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Prior to certification of the DSP, a copy of the approved 100-year floodplain study shall be submitted for verification of the location of the proposed floodplain. All plans shall show the approved configuration of the proposed 100-year floodplain.

2. Prior to certification of the DSP, the Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII/128/90-03) shall be revised as follows:
 - a. Show the clear depiction of the phases on the cover sheet and provide a note regarding which phase is associated with each TCPII revision.
 - b. Eliminate any encroachments into the regulated areas that were not previously approved; Show the required tree protection fencing and permanent afforestation/reforestation fencing and signage.
 - c. Provide a detail for the permanent afforestation fencing.
 - d. Show the proposed building and parking configurations for the current phase.
 - e. Consistently show all of the information on the TCPII on the DSP.
 - f. Revise the plan to eliminate Tree Conservation Area 1 shown on Sheet 4 of 14 because it is less than 2,500 square feet in area.
 - g. Provide a woodland conservation worksheet, which reflects all revisions made to the plan.
 - h. Provide a legend to show all symbols used on the plan on every sheet.
 - i. When all the revisions have been completed, have the plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.
3. Prior to certification of the DSP, a field investigation shall be conducted to verify the woodlands that remain on the site. The qualified professional shall verify this information and the preservation areas shown on the plans shall depict the woodlands that remain on-site.
4. Prior to signature approval of the detailed site plan, provide a standard sidewalk along the subject site's entire frontage of Walker Mill Road extended and Ritchie Marlboro Road, unless modified by DPW&T.
5. Prior to signature approval of the detailed site plan, the applicant shall:
 - a. Provide copies of the new storm water management plan demonstrating that Parcel D is no longer required and that there is no increase in the number of lots.
 - b. Revise the site bearings and distances to match the final plat with the detailed site plan.
6. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall file a new record plat to conform to the new detailed site plan.

7. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a detailed site plan of the individual pad sites of the retail portion of the office/warehouse for approval by the planning board.

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 Squire, seconded by Commissioner Vaughns, with Commissioners Squire, Vaughns, Eley and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, October 10, 2005, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 5th day of January 2006.

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:EE:rmk