

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 November 29, 2007, regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-06030 for Prince George's Plaza, BB&T Bank, West Hyattsville, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** This detailed site plan is for the purpose of constructing a bank of 4,510 square feet in the Prince George's Plaza Shopping Center in Subarea 13B of the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Overlay Zone. An existing structure, which has been occupied by a check cashing facility and was constructed in 1981, will be demolished. Accompanying this detailed site plan is a request for amendments to the transit development standards.

2. **Development Data**

Detailed Site Plan DSP-06030  
BB&T—West Hyattsville

Zone	T-D-O-Z (C-S-C)
Total Site Area	0.99 acre
Use	Bank
Existing Gross Floor Area (to be demolished)	3,422 sf
Proposed Gross Floor Area	4,510 sf
Number of Existing Parking Spaces (surface)	15 spaces
Number of Proposed Parking Spaces (surface)	15 spaces
Loading Spaces Required:	0 spaces
Loading Spaces Provided:	0 spaces

3. **Location:** The location of the building pad is approximately 44 feet from the face of curb of MD 410, at its intersection with Toledo Terrace.
4. **Previous Approvals:** A building permit was issued in 1980 for the existing bank structure on the site. In 1999, the District Council approved the rezoning of the property from the C-O Zone to the C-S-C Zone. No conditions were attached to the zoning change.

5. Section 27-548.08(c)(1), Required Findings for a Detailed Site Plan in the Transit District Overlay Zone (TDOZ), includes the following findings:

**(A) The Transit District Site Plan is in strict conformance with any Mandatory Development Requirements of the Transit District Development Plan;**

**Comment:** The applicant has requested modifications from the development standards for this project. The detailed site plan does not meet all of the development standards and the applicant requests amendments to the development standards. As a part of this DSP application, the applicant is requesting amendments to Subarea 13B guidelines P106, P108, and P109, and areawide standards S8, S17, S18, S23, S31, S33, S75. The following provides a discussion of the amendment requests and a response from both the applicant and staff:

- **P106 (page 124, TDDP)—The minimum building height shall be 4 stories.**

**Applicant Comment:** “The subject site is relatively small in size and is currently developed with a one-story, block-type structure. Four-story densities cannot be supported on the parcel based upon the parking requirements. Additionally, the proposed bank is a single-use proposal. Four-story structures would typically be more consistent with a multitenant office building. The proposed use is a dramatic improvement over the existing situation and will enhance the overall quality of the transit district. The proposed building height of 27 feet is equivalent to a two-story building mass.”

**Staff Comment:** “The design goals of the TDDP are to encourage the placement of buildings along East West Highway, Toledo and Belcrest Roads, and Toledo Terrace so that they define the space, create a pedestrian-friendly environment and minimize views of parking areas.” (page 28, TDDP). Originally, the applicant located the bank building in the middle of the site with vehicles circulating around the building. The revised plan relocates the two-story building nearer to the streetscape and is a considerable improvement toward meeting the design goals of the TDDP. The revised site plan takes into account the proximity of the site to the Post Park development, which is largely residential, and creates the opportunity to introduce a coherent and coordinated system of people-oriented spaces. The request to amend the minimum height of the building from four stories to 27 feet is reasonable, in that the proposal of a four-story building on the site would look awkward, as the base of the building would be rather small in proportion to the height of a four-story building. Staff supports the request for relief from the development standard to allow the buildings to be less than four stories.

- **P108 (page 124, TDDP)—A build-to line shall be established 40 feet from face of curb along East West Highway.**

**Applicant Comment:** “A build-to line shall be established 44 feet from face of curb along East West Highway. The site design has been revised to eliminate drive aisles in front of the building along East West Highway. The building has been pulled as close to East West Highway and Toledo Terrace as possible. An existing storm drainage pipe prevents the building from meeting a 40-foot build-to line.”

**Staff Comment:** Originally, the applicant located the bank building 51 feet from the curb to allow for vehicle circulation around the building. The revised site plan eliminates the drive aisles in front of the building along East West Highway and pulls the building as close to East West Highway and Toledo Terrace as possible, in a way that better defines the space and creates a more pedestrian-friendly environment in keeping with the goals of the TDDP. The relief of four feet from the requirement will not be visually noticeable. Staff supports the request to amend the development standard to increase the build-to-line from 40 feet to 44 feet.

- **P109 (page 124, TDDP)—Build-to lines shall be 20 feet from face of curb along Toledo Terrace.**

**Applicant Comment:** “The subject property is a corner lot. On the Toledo Terrace frontage, the building cannot meet the build-to line. Emphasis was placed on pulling the building toward East West Highway. Given the primary goal of pulling the building up close to East West Highway and the location of the existing storm drain pipe, 38 feet is the achievable build-to line from Toledo Terrace.”

**Staff Comment:** Originally, the applicant located the bank building 111 feet from Toledo Terrace to allow for vehicle circulation around the building. The revised plan places the building 38 feet from the right-of-way. This current proposal is a considerable improvement toward meeting the design goals of the TDDP. The revised site plan eliminates the drive aisles in front of the building along East West Highway and pulls the building as close to East West Highway and Toledo Terrace as possible, in a way that serves the utility of the structure and creates a more pedestrian-friendly environment in keeping with the goals of the TDDP. Staff supports the request for relief from the development standard to increase the build-to-line from 20 feet to 38 feet.

- **S8 (page 31, TDDP)—All property frontages shall be improved in accordance with Figures 7, 8 and 9 in order to create a visually continuous and unified streetscape.**

**Applicant Comment:** “Subject to the comments in Subsection III of the justification statement, the frontage improvements will be coordinated with other developments adjacent to the site to create a visually continuous and unified streetscape.”

**Staff Comment:** The applicant offered no further discussion of this requirement in Subsection III. The proposed plans are consistent with the amendments granted on the property to the east, Prince George’s Plaza shopping center. Therefore, in the interests of achieving a unified streetscape, staff supports the reduction in the width of the streetscape.

- **S17 (S17, 18 and 23 pertinent to parking and loading are found on page 38, TDDP)—S17 provides that all parking lots shall in general, be located behind buildings and shall not occupy more than 33 percent of the frontage of any subarea along a pedestrian street. For corner subareas with frontage on East West Highway,**

**parking along the East West Highway frontage shall be minimized and parking shall not extend beyond the building facade facing East West Highway.**

**Applicant Comment:** “Regarding S17, the configuration and size of the parcel makes it impracticable to locate all the parking in the rear of the building especially on a corner lot. Circulation is provided to allow for efficient use. Drive aisles in front of the building along East West Highway and on the Toledo Terrace frontage of the building have been eliminated. Parking is kept to a minimum and is less than the caps established by the TDDP.”

**Staff Comment:** The proposal meets the design goals of the TDDP to emphasize an urban, pedestrian-oriented development perspective. The relief requested from S17 is minor, as most of the parking has been removed from the front of the building along East West Highway. None of the parking is located along Toledo Terrace. Staff supports the request to allow more than 33 percent of the frontage of the subarea to be dedicated toward parking and vehicular circulation.

- **S18 provides that all parking lots shall not extend beyond the build-to-line or project beyond the front plane of adjoining buildings.**

**Applicant Comment:** “Regarding S18, the vast majority of the parking has been located behind the build-to line of the building. The configuration and size of the parcel makes it impracticable to locate all the parking in the rear of the building. Because the parcel is a corner lot, there really is no rear of the building. The parking has been located in a nonintrusive part of the site. Circulation is provided to allow for efficient use.”

**Staff Comment:** Only a small portion of one parking space extends beyond the build-to-line of the building. Staff supports the request for relief from the development standard to allow one parking space to extend beyond the proposed build-to line.

- **S23 (page 38, TDDP and S75, page 125, TDDP) provides that all surface parking lots shall be screened from view of roadways by the use of both a low, opaque wall and an evergreen hedge unless they are providing short-term parking for ten cars or fewer.**

**Applicant Comment:** “Regarding S23, appropriate screening is achieved by changes in grade from the street level to the building level. Plantings and a retaining wall are included in the landscape plan to supplement screening. All parking is short term in nature for this application.”

**Staff Comment:** The screening referred to in S23 and S75 is the concept of screening the front of vehicles up to three feet from the view from the streetscape. The plan proposes both a retaining wall and a freestanding one in one structure.

- **S31 (page 69, TDDP)—At the time of Detailed Site Plan, the number of trash cans and locations shall be shown on the plan. Trash receptacles should be placed in**

**strategic locations to prevent litter from accumulating in and around the proposed development.**

**Applicant Comment:** “The applicant is proposing to include trash receptacles within the building and at the drive through and ATM stations.”

**Staff Comment:** The proposal of the applicant to fulfill the requirement by placing trash receptacles within the building and at the locations where trash could be generated makes sense.

- **S33 (page 71, TDDP)—Afforestation of at least 10 percent of the gross tract shall be required on all properties within the Prince George’s Plaza Transit District currently exempt from the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance. Afforestation shall occur on site or within the Anacostia Watershed in Prince George’s County, with priority given to riparian zones and nontidal wetlands, particularly within the Northwest Branch sub-watershed.**

**Applicant Comment:** “The applicant has received a TCP waiver letter. The letter of exemption was issued May 19, 2006, Exemption Number S-159-06.”

**Staff Comment:** The site is exempt from the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance. Ten percent of the gross tract area (.09 acre) is planted with shade trees, which will provide a canopy for ten percent of the site area. The plans have been reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section and demonstrate that ten percent of the area is tree cover. Staff supports the request for relief from the development standard as an alternative to the requirement above.

**S3 All primary and secondary walkways shall be well lighted to a minimum of 1.25 foot candles.**

**Comment:** This information should be demonstrated prior to signature approval. A photometric plan should be submitted prior to signature approval to demonstrate conformance to this requirement.

**(B) The Transit District Site Plan is consistent with, and reflects the guidelines and criteria contained in the Transit District Development Plan;**

The Transit District Site Plan will be consistent with, and reflect the guidelines and criteria contained in, the Transit District Development Plan when the conditions of approval below are met. The following guidelines warrant discussion:

- **G2 (page 30, TDDP)—Pedestrian links should be barrier free.**

**Applicant Comment:** Access along East West Highway is by means of stairs through the retaining wall, but alternate barrier-free access has been provided at the vehicle entryway along Toledo Terrace. The rapid elevation change and retaining wall does not allow for barrier-free

access along East West Highway.

**Staff Comment:** The applicant also is seeking to amend Development Guideline G2, which requires pedestrian links to be barrier free. Due to evaluation changes and the proposed retaining wall, the access to the East West Highway pedestrian walkway would be by means of a stairway, which should also include ADA accessible ramps. It does not appear that the accessible route provided from Toledo Terrace is convenient or safe.

**Recommended Condition:** Prior to the approval of the proposed detailed site, the plan shall be revised to include ADA-accessible ramps as part of the pedestrian stairway extending from the building entrance to the proposed walkway along MD 410. The proposed walkway along MD 410 shall be extended from the Toledo Terrace intersection along the entire property frontage and connect to the portion constructed along the plaza frontage.

- **G6—Office buildings fronting on pedestrian pathways should be consciously designed with a base scaled to relate to pedestrian activities.**

**Applicant Comment:** “The proposed use is a bank building, which will have a pedestrian friendly scale.”

**Staff Comment:** The staff agrees that the building is designed to a pedestrian-friendly scale.

- **G9—(Page 35, TDDP) All sides of a building should receive equal design consideration if viewed from a public area.**

**Applicant Comment:** “Attention is given to all four sides in the building architecture.”

**Staff Comment:** Overall, the applicant has revised the original proposal to comply as best it can given the constraints of the site with the goals of the TDDP to provide a pedestrian-oriented streetscape. The proposed building addresses the corner location to better promote an urban, pedestrian-oriented development perspective required by the TDDP. The exterior finish of the building includes primarily brick. The gables are exterior insulation finish systems (EIFS) in a beige color. Asphalt shingles are proposed as the roofing material. Overall, the appearance of the buildings is attractive on all four sides of the building.

- **G10 (page 35, TDDP)—Building rooflines should be designed to create architectural interest and contribute to the overall identity of the area.**

**Applicant Comment:** “Articulated rooflines are included.”

**Staff Comment:** The articulation of the rooflines is varied through the use of gables and reverse gable treatment.

- **G11 (Page 35, TDDP)—Primary entrances should be designed as one of the major architectural features so they are clearly identifiable and offer a sense of arrival.**

**Applicant Comment:** “The main entrance is clearly identified in the design of the building.”

**Staff Comment:** There are two main entrances into the structure, one along East West Highway and the other along the east side of the building, directly accessible from the parking area. The entrances are clearly identified in the design of the structure.

- (C) The Transit District Site Plan meets all of the requirements of the Transit District Overlay Zone and applicable regulations of the underlying zones;**

**Comment:** The development data provided in Finding 2 demonstrates conformance to the C-S-C Zone.

- (D) The location, size and design of buildings, signs, other structures, open spaces, landscaping, pedestrian and vehicular circulation systems, and parking and loading areas maximize safety and efficiency and are adequate to meet the purposes of the Transit District Overlay Zone;**

The proposed redevelopment minimizes conflicts between pedestrian and vehicular circulation systems. The plan also provides adequate open space areas for landscaping in and around the linear pedestrian walkways, provides for safe and efficient parking areas, and is adequate to meet the purposes of the TDOZ.

- (E) Each structure and use, in the manner proposed, is compatible with other structures in the Transit District and with existing and proposed adjacent development.**

The proposed building will be situated on the site in a manner that is compatible with the surrounding existing and proposed development. This building will be placed so that when viewed from any direction, the structure is equally detailed in a manner to reflect a unified and consistent treatment.

6. The Community Planning Division has reviewed the site plan as proposed and has provided comments in their memorandum. This application is not inconsistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies for the Developed Tier and this application conforms to the land use recommendations of the 1998 *Approved Transit District Development Plan for the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Overlay Zone* for retail-commercial use. The Community Planning Division supported the proposed alternative language for the development district standards.
7. The Transportation Planning Division has reviewed the above referenced detailed site plan for the proposed construction of a two-story bank building consisting of 4,510 square feet on the subject site. The proposed development will replace the existing one-story building. The proposed plan

also includes provision of all 15 surface parking spaces that existed on the site prior to the approval of the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Development Plan (TDDP). All pre-existing parking is exempt from meeting the parking requirements of the TDDP.

### **Prince George's Plaza Transit District Development Plan:**

The approved Prince George's Plaza Transit District Development Plan (TDDP) guides the use and development of all properties within its boundaries. The findings and recommendations outlined below are based upon staff evaluation of the submitted site plan and the ways in which the proposed development conforms to the mandatory development requirements and guidelines outlined in the TDDP.

During the preparation of the TDDP, staff performed an analysis of all road facilities in the vicinity of the TDOZ. This analysis was based on establishment of a Transit District-wide cap on the number of additional parking spaces (preferred and premium) that can be constructed or provided in the transit district to accommodate any new development. Pursuant to this concept, the plan recommends implementing a system of developer contributions to ensure adequacy of the transportation facilities, based on the number of additional parking spaces, as long as the authorized total parking limits and their attendant, respective, parking ratios (Tables 5 and 6 of the TDDP) are not exceeded. The collected fee will be applied toward the required number of transportation improvements totaling \$1,562,000, as summarized in Table 4 of the TDDP. These improvements are needed to ensure that the critical roadways and intersections in the transit district will remain adequate and will be operating at or above Level of Service E, as required by the plan. Among the most consequential of these are:

- A. Establishment of a Transit District-wide cap on the number of additional surface parking spaces (3,000 preferred plus 1,000 premium) that can be constructed or provided in the Transit District to accommodate any new development.
- B. Implementation of a system of developer contributions, based on the number of preferred and premium surface parking spaces attributed to each development project. The contributions are intended to recover sufficient funding to defray some of the cost of the transportation improvements as summarized in Table 4 of the TDDP and are needed to ensure that the critical roadways and intersections in the transit district remain at or above the stated LOS.
- C. Retaining a mandatory Transportation Demand Management District (TDMD). The TDMD was established by the 1992 TDDP plan to ensure optimum utilization of trip reduction measures (TRMs) to combine, or divert to transit, as many peak hour SOV trips as possible, and to capitalize on the existing transit system in the district. The TDMD will continue to have boundaries that are coterminous with the transit district. As of this writing, the Prince George's Plaza Transportation Demand Management District (TDMD) has not been legally established under the TDMD Ordinance (now Subtitle 20A, Division 2 of the County Code) enacted in 1993.

- D. Developing an annual TDMD operations fee based on the total number of parking spaces (surface and structured), each property owner maintains.
- E. Requiring that the TDMD on an annual basis to prepare transit district transportation and parking operations analysis that would determine whether or not the LOS E has been maintained, and to determine additional trip reduction, transportation and parking management measures that are required to restore LOS E. Reauthorization of the Prince George’s Plaza Transportation Management Association recommended in the predecessor 1992 PG-TDDP.

**Status of Surface Parking in the Transit District**

Pursuant to the Planning Board’s previous approvals of detailed site plans in the Transit District, the remaining available preferred and premium surface parking for the Transit District and each class of land use are reduced to the following values:

	RESIDENTIAL		OFFICE/RESCH		RETAIL		TOTAL	
	PREF.	PREM	PREF.	PREM	PREF.	PREM	PREF.	PREM
TDDP Caps	920	310	1,170	390	910	300	3,000	1,000
Subarea 1	(178)							
Subarea 4					(121)			
Subarea 5- Retail + Office					(74)			
Subarea 6					(72)			
Subarea 9					(321)			
Subarea 10A			(82)		(191)	(15)		
Unallocated	742	310	1,088	390	135	285	2,031	985

As structure parking is not included in the parking caps pursuant to MDR P6, the parking figures reported above do not include the number of parking spaces that will be constructed as structured parking in each subarea. The subject Subarea 13B is not included in the chart above because the proposal has no net impact on the calculations above; 15 spaces exist on the site and 15 spaces are proposed.

**Detailed Site Plan Findings**

- A. The PG-TDDP identifies the subject property as part of the Subarea 13B of the Transit District. There are 15 subareas in the Transit District, two of which are designated as open space and will remain undeveloped. The proposed site consists of approximately 0.99 acre of land in the C-S-C Zone. The property is located on the northeast quadrant of East West Highway (MD 410) and Toledo Terrace.
- B. The proposed application is for construction of 4,510 square feet commercial banking

center.

The applicant is proposing to reconstruct all 15 surface parking spaces that currently exist and also are exempt from the TDDP parking requirements. Since no additional parking beside the exempt spaces are proposed, the approval of the proposed detailed site plan will have no negative effect on the number of available preferred or premium parking for the Transit District.

- C. The applicant seeks to amend the Mandatory Development Guidelines P106 (dealing with minimum building height), P108 (dealing with a build-to line for East West Highway), and P110 (dealing with a build-to line for Toledo Terrace). Staff offers no additional comments as they are not transportation related.
- D. Internal vehicular and pedestrian circulation patterns as shown are acceptable.

#### **Transportation Staff Analysis and Conclusions**

Based on the preceding findings, the Transportation Planning Section concludes that the proposed development as proposed does conform to the circulation requirements of the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Development Plan, provided that:

- A. Prior to the certification of the detailed site plan, the applicant shall obtain approval from MD-SHA and the Prince George's County DPW&T and agree to fully fund and provide pedestrian crosswalks across Toledo Terrace at the proposed site entrance and at its intersection with MD 410.
8. The Transportation Planning Office also reviewed the detailed site plan for conformance with the Countywide Trails Plan and/or the appropriate area master plan.

The subject application is located within the area covered by the Prince George's Transit District Development Plan. As noted by the submitted justification statement, the subject application is impacted by Mandatory Development Requirement P1, which reads:

**P1—Unless otherwise stated within the Subarea Specific Requirements, each developer, applicant, and the applicant's heirs, successors and/or assignees, shall be responsible for streetscape improvements along the entire length of the property frontage from the building envelope to face of curb (See Figures 7, 8, and 9. Toledo Terrace: 20-foot pedestrian zone; East West Highway: 40-foot pedestrian zone; Belcrest Road: 20 – 40 foot pedestrian zone.) These improvements shall be included as part of any application for building or grading permits, except for permits for interior alterations which do not constitute redevelopment as defined in the previous chapter. No building or grading permits shall be issued without a detailed site plan which indicates conformance with the streetscape requirements of the TDDP. Construction of the streetscaping improvements shall be in phase with development,**

**or the construction schedule shall be determined at the time of detailed site plan.**

The applicant has stated that due to the requirements of the drive-through building, it will not be practical to meet the requirements of the streetscape. However, it should be noted that the frontage of East West Highway for the adjacent Prince George's Plaza has been improved with an eight-foot-wide concrete sidewalk with crosswalks constructed of contrasting pavement material (see attached aerial). Although these improvements do not completely fulfill the requirements of the TDDP, they do work within the existing site constraints and greatly improve the pedestrian facilities and streetscape along East West Highway. Staff recommends that this sidewalk and streetscape treatment be continued across the frontage of the subject site, as shown on the plan.

The site immediately across Toledo Terrace Road from the subject site has also provided road frontage improvements along East West Highway and Toledo Terrace Road. These are described in the resolution for approved DSP-03036 as:

**The site plan indicates substantial compliance with this requirement. A pedestrian zone which ranges approximately from 26 feet to 34 feet in width has been provided along MD 410. This area includes a 10-foot minimum width green strip, with an 8-foot-wide trail/sidewalk, and an additional 6-foot-wide grass strip. Likewise, an approximately 16-foot-wide pedestrian area is provided along Toledo Terrace. This area includes an 8-foot- wide landscaped strip and an 8-foot-wide sidewalk/trail.**

In keeping with approved DSP-03036 frontage improvements along Toledo Road and Figure 8 of the TDDP, staff recommends that an eight-foot-wide sidewalk be provided along the subject site's frontage of Toledo Terrace Road, as shown on the plan. This wide sidewalk will be in place of the existing standard sidewalk and be separated from the curb by a grass or landscaped strip.

It appears that the wide sidewalk and landscape strips can be provided along both East West Highway and Toledo Terrace Road within the green buffer currently proposed along the edge of the site.

**TRAILS RECOMMENDATION:**

In conformance with the adopted and approved Prince George's Plaza Transit District Development Plan and consistent with improvements made on adjacent or nearby sites, the applicant the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall:

- A. Construct an eight-foot wide sidewalk along the subject site's entire frontage of East West Highway. This sidewalk shall be separated from the curb by a grass or landscaping strip and be consistent with the improvements implemented on the adjacent site, as shown on the plan.
- B. Construct an eight-foot wide sidewalk along the subject site's entire frontage of Toledo Terrace Road. This sidewalk shall be separated from the curb by a grass or landscaping

strip and be consistent with the improvements implemented on the adjacent site, as shown on the plan.

9. The plans have been reviewed for conformance to the *Landscape Manual* and staff finds that the plans adhere to the requirements within the *Landscape Manual*, except for the eastern property line adjacent to the Prince George's Plaza shopping center. Alternative compliance is requested for Section 4.7 (Buffering Incompatible Uses) of the *Landscape Manual* along the eastern property line.

The site is classified as a medium-impact use and is immediately adjacent to Prince George's Plaza, a shopping center classified as a high-impact use. Therefore, in accordance with Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, of the *Landscape Manual*, a Type B bufferyard is required along the eastern property line of the bank site.

REQUIRED: Section 4.7 Buffering Incompatible Uses, along the eastern boundary of the property.

Length of bufferyard:	154 feet
Building setback:	30 feet
Landscape yard:	20 feet
Existing woodland:	0 percent
Plant units (80 PUs/100 LF):	124 plant units

PROVIDED:

Building setback:	105 feet
Landscape yard:	Ranges in width from 5.6 feet to approximately 30 feet
Plant units:	145 plant units
Fence:	Yes, however this fence is not opaque or sight-tight. Therefore, it does not warrant a 50 percent reduction in the required number of plant units.

JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDATION:

The application does not meet the strict requirements of Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, for the bufferyard along the eastern property line. The applicant is providing the required 20-foot-wide buffer for approximately 60 linear feet of the bufferyard. The bufferyard along the remaining 94 feet of the property line does not meet the 20-foot requirement and ranges from 5.6 to 19 feet wide. The applicant proffered a six-foot-tall, sight-tight wooden fence in an effort to further buffer the bank from the adjacent shopping center. However, it is the position of the committee that this type of fencing would be incompatible with the proposed development of the bank, which includes an extensive brick retaining wall topped by wrought-iron fencing along the site's East West Highway and Toledo Terrace frontages. Therefore, pursuant to the committee's recommendation, the applicant has proposed the incorporation of estate-style fencing along the eastern property line, both sides of which will be planted with an attractive combination of plant materials. Pursuant to Section 4.7 of the *Landscape Manual*, 124 plant units are required along

this property line absent sight-tight fencing. In its totality, the bufferyard contains 145 plant units. The committee feels that the proposed combination of estate-style fencing and planting along the eastern property line renders this proposal equal to or better than normal compliance with the requirements of the *Landscape Manual*.

#### ALTERNATIVE COMPLIANCE RECOMMENDATION:

The Alternative Compliance Committee and the Planning Director recommends approval of alternative compliance pursuant to Section 4.7 of the *Landscape Manual* along the eastern property line for BB&T Bank West Hyattsville.

10. The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed the above-referenced Detailed Site Plan DSP-06030, for Prince George's Plaza, BB&T Bank, stamped as received on August 14, 2006. The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of Detailed Site Plan DSP-06030, subject to the conditions at the end of this memorandum

The Environmental Planning Section has no records of any previous applications for this property. The subject property is located in the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Overlay Zone.

A review of the information available indicates that no streams, wetlands, wetland buffers or 100-year floodplain are found to occur on the property. The soils found to occur according to the Prince George's County Soil Survey is Sunnyside-Urban Land Complex. The Sunnyside series, which is the predominant soil on site, poses no difficulties for development. MD 410 is an arterial roadway generally regulated for noise; however, the noise levels would not exceed the state noise standards for the proposed use. According to information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Natural Heritage Program, there are no rare, threatened or endangered species found to occur in the vicinity. There are no scenic or historic roads in the vicinity of this site. The property is located in Subarea 13b of the Prince George's Plaza Transportation District Overlay Zone and is in the Developed Tier according to the approved 2002 General Plan.

#### **The Prince George's Plaza Transit District Overlay Zone**

In addition to the normal site requirements that apply to specific zoning categories, properties in the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Overlay Zone have districtwide and subarea requirements and guidelines. This memorandum will first address the districtwide environmental requirements, then the subarea requirements, and finally any remaining environmental issues. Below is a summary of the districtwide and subarea environmental requirements that apply to this site.

#### *District-wide Requirements and Guidelines*

**Mandatory Development Requirements P25, P26 and P27 address stormwater management requirements.**

**Comment:** A stormwater management concept approval letter with associated plans were not submitted with this application. The requirements for the stormwater management will be met through subsequent reviews by the Department of Environmental Resources.

**S32 requires that all stormdrain inlets associated with this development be stenciled with “Do Not Dump, Chesapeake Bay Drainage.” This requirement is required to be addressed at time of detailed site plan review. None of this information is shown on the plans submitted.**

**Recommended Condition:** Prior to certificate approval, the DSP shall show the location of trash cans throughout the site and shall contain the following note: “All stormdrain inlets shall be stenciled with the words ‘Do Not Dump, Chesapeake Bay Drainage.’”

**P33 “Each Preliminary Plat, Conceptual and/or Detailed Site Plan shall show a 65 dBA (Ldn) noise contour based upon average daily traffic volumes at Level-of-Service E. Upon plan submittal, the Natural Resources Division shall determine if a noise study is required based on the delineation of the noise contour.”**

**Comment:** The model shows the contour 230 feet from centerline of MD 410. These noise levels do not exceed the state noise standards for the use as proposed.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

As revisions are made to the plans submitted, the revision boxes on each plan sheet shall be used to describe when revisions were made and by whom.

- A. This property is not subject to the provisions of the Prince George’s County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because the site contains less than 10,000 square feet of existing woodlands and there is no previously approved tree conservation plan. A standard letter of exemption required in compliance with the Woodland Conservation Ordinance was not submitted with the review package. Attached is a standard letter of exemption for the subject property. No further action is needed at this time as it relates to woodland requirements. The letter of exemption should accompany all future application for plans and permits.
- B. A stormwater management concept approval letter was not submitted with the subject application, nor was there any evidence of compliance. Requirements for stormwater management will be met through subsequent reviews by the Department of Environmental Resources.

**Recommended Condition:** Prior to certificate approval of the detailed site plan, a copy of the stormwater management concept approval letter with associated plans must be submitted.

- 11. The Mayor and Common Council of University Park were sent the application, but as of the writing of this report, have not yet provided their comments on the plan

12. The City of Hyattsville reviewed the application, . and provided the following comment contained in letter dated November 27, 2007, Mayor Gardiner to Chairman Parker:

“The Hyattsville City Council has not formally reviewed this application, although the City Administrator and I have met with the applicant as the proposal has been developed and modified. I believe the applicant has tried to meet the TDOZ requirements while still retaining the type of standard building BB&T uses for its branches.

“I understand the applicant is requesting an amendment to the minimum building height, which requires a referral to the a District Council. The City Council may comment on the project at that time.”

13. The proposed detailed site plan represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines, without requiring unreasonable costs 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:

- A. Recommends APPROVAL to the District Council of the following amendment:

**P106**—To allow the building height to be reduced from a minimum of four stories to the proposed building height of 27 feet.

- B. APPROVED the following amendments:

**P108**—To allow the request to increase the build-to line from 40 feet to 44 feet along MD 410.

**P109**—To allow the request to increase the build-to line from 20 feet to 38 feet along Toledo Terrace.

**S8**—For the purpose of creating a unified streetscape along the frontage of MD 410, the applicant is asking to reduce the width of the streetscape in accordance with the width of the streetscape provided along the adjacent plaza shopping center.

**S17**—For the purpose of allowing more than 33 percent of the frontage of the project, along MD 410 and Toledo Terrace to be areas of parking and vehicular circulation.

**S18**—For the purpose of allowing a small portion of the parking lot to extend beyond the proposed build-to line.

**S23**—For the purpose of allowing the wall to partially screen the front of vehicles from the view from the roadway, with the use of a wall that will extend no higher than 5.5 feet

**S31**—For the purpose of providing the use of trash receptacles to be located within the building and at the drive-through and ATM stations.

**S33**—For the purpose of allowing the fulfillment of the ten percent requirement for woodland conservation through the use of shade trees providing ten percent tree cover on the site.

**S75** (same as S23)—For the purpose of allowing the wall to partially screen the front of vehicles from the view from the roadway, with the use of the wall that will extend no higher than 5.5 feet

- C. APPROVED the Detailed Site Plan DSP-06030 and Alternative Compliance No. AC-07021, subject to the following conditions:
1. Prior to certificate of approval, the following revisions shall be made:
    - a. The DSP shall clearly show the location of trash cans throughout the site and shall contain the following note: “All stormdrain inlets shall be stenciled with the words ‘Do Not Dump, Chesapeake Bay Drainage.’”
    - b. A copy of the stormwater management concept approval letter with associated plans must be submitted to the Environmental Planning Section for Review.
    - c. The applicant shall obtain approval from MD-SHA and the Prince George’s County DPW&T and agree to fully fund and provide pedestrian crosswalks across Toledo Terrace at the proposed site entrance and at its intersection with MD 410.
    - d. The plan shall be revised to include ADA-accessible ramps as part of the pedestrian access extending from the building entrance to the proposed walkway along MD 410. The proposed streetscape along MD 410 shall be extended from the Toledo Terrace intersection along the entire property frontage and connect to the streetscape improvements constructed along the Prince George’s Plaza shopping center frontage.
    - e. The plans shall be revised to indicate that the paving of the sidewalk within the streetscape shall be identical to the paving constructed in the streetscape in front of Prince George’s Plaza, in order to provide a continuous appearance to the improvements within the entire streetscape along MD 410.
    - f. A photometric plan should be submitted to demonstrate a minimum of 1.25 foot candles have been provided for all walkways.

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 Clark, with Commissioners Squire, Clark, Vaughns, Cavitt and Parker voting in favor of the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, November 29, 2007, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 20<sup>th</sup> day of December 2007.

Oscar S. Rodriguez  
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin  
Planning Board Administrator

OSR:FJG:SL:bjs