



*Note: Staff reports can be accessed at [www.mncppc.org/pgco/planning/plan.htm](http://www.mncppc.org/pgco/planning/plan.htm).*


## Detailed Site Plan

## DSP-12051

Application	General Data	
<p><b>Project Name:</b> Andrews Ridge Apartments</p> <p><b>Location:</b> On the southern side of Suitland Road (MD 218), between its intersection with Regency Parkway to the west and Walls Lane to the east.</p> <p><b>Applicant/Address:</b> AG/TDG Pinewood, LLC. Andrews Ridge Apartments 5601-7 Regency Park Court Suitland, MD 20746</p>	Planning Board Hearing Date:	05/30/13
	Staff Report Date:	05/15/13
	Date Accepted:	03/25/13
	Planning Board Action Limit:	06/03/13
	Plan Acreage:	11.06
	Zone:	R-18
	Dwelling Units:	N/A
	Gross Floor Area:	2,503 sq. ft.
	Planning Area:	75A
	Tier:	Developed
	Council District:	07
	Election District	06
	Municipality:	N/A
200-Scale Base Map:	205SE05	

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates	
A 2,503-square-foot community building/leasing office for an existing multifamily complex.	Informational Mailing:	11/01/12
	Acceptance Mailing:	03/20/13
	Sign Posting Deadline:	04/30/13

<b>Staff Recommendation</b>		<p><b>Staff Reviewer:</b> Ruth Grover, M.U.P., A.I.C.P  <b>Phone Number:</b> 301-952-4317  <b>Email Address:</b> Ruth.Grover@ppd.mncppc.org</p>	
<b>APPROVAL</b>	<b>APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS</b>	<b>DISAPPROVAL</b>	<b>DISCUSSION</b>
	<b>X</b>		



THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL  
PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Detailed Site Plan DSP-12051  
Andrews Ridge Apartments  
Alternative Compliance AC-13007

The Urban Design staff has reviewed the detailed site plan for the subject property and presents the following evaluation and findings leading to a recommendation of APPROVAL with conditions as described in the Recommendation Section of this report.

EVALUATION

The detailed site plan was reviewed and evaluated for conformance with the following criteria:

- a. The requirements of the Zoning Ordinance in the Multifamily Medium Density Residential (R-18) Zone.
- b. The requirements of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*.
- c. The requirements of the Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance.
- d. The requirements of the Prince George's County Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance.
- e. Referral comments.

FINDINGS

Based upon the analysis of the subject application, the Urban Design staff recommends the following findings:

1. **Request:** The subject application requests approval of a one-story, 2,503-square-foot community building/leasing office for an existing multifamily residential development.

2. **Development Data Summary:**

	<b>EXISTING</b>	<b>PROPOSED</b>
<b>Zone</b>	R-18	R-18
<b>Use(s)</b>	Residential	Residential
<b>Acreage</b>	11.06	11.06
<b>Number of Dwelling Units</b>	241	241
<b>Number of Square Feet</b>	1,267	3,770

**Parking**

	<b>REQUIRED</b>	<b>EXISTING</b>
Parking	554	302*
Loading	1	0*

\*Approved per Certified Nonconforming Use CNU-40990-07

3. **Location:** The subject site is located on the southern side of Suitland Road (MD 218), between its intersections with Regency Parkway to the west and Walls Lane to the east.
4. **Surrounding Uses:** The site is bounded to the north by the right-of-way of Suitland Road with the Regency Meadows townhome development in the R-T (Townhouse) Zone beyond; to the east by the right-of-way of Walls Lane with a church in the C-S-C (Commercial Shopping Center) Zone and a single-family home in the R-55 (One-Family Detached Residential) Zone beyond; to the south by the Suitland Housing Corporation/Imperial Gardens multifamily housing complex in the R-18 Zone; and to the west by the right-of-way of Regency Parkway and vacant R-T-zoned land owned by The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC).
5. **Previous Approvals:** The project is subject to the requirements of Certified Nonconforming Use CNU-40990-07. It is also subject to Special Exception SE-3812, which was approved for a gas station on the property on February 1, 1989, but never constructed. The site is also the subject of approved Stomwater Management Concept Plan 1407-2012-00, approved on March 19, 2012 and valid until March 19, 2015.
6. **Design Features:** The overall multifamily complex is composed of six multistory, multifamily housing buildings. More particularly, starting with the most western building and moving around the site in a clockwise direction, the existing buildings on-site have the following characteristics:

<b>Building number</b>	<b>Height (in feet)</b>	<b>Gross Square Footage</b>	<b>Number of Apartments</b>	<b>Number of Stories</b>
1	38	13,704	42	3
2	36.5	13,712	46	4
3	28	13,911	42	3
4	32.7	8,364	28	3
5	37.5	13,851	41	3
6	28	15,410	42	3

The request in the instant case is to provide a dual function, 2,503-square-foot leasing office/community building for the Andrews Ridge Apartments. The proposed building is to be located on a portion of the property formally occupied by a swimming pool that is currently vacant. The design program for the building includes an exercise room, a library, and a meeting room to be used by the residents of Andrews Ridge Apartments, and leasing and other offices to be used by the owner and the employees of the Andrews Ridge Apartments.

The proposed building is a one-story structure, resembling a single-family detached house. The architecture for the proposed building is of a typical single-family detached appearance, with clearly identified front and rear elevations. Given that the community building leasing office is surrounded by existing apartment buildings, the elevations of the proposed building should have similar fenestration and architectural articulation.

The front façade is the most attractive of the four elevations, offering three gables and a regular pattern of fenestration with shuttered windows and a front paneled door, emphasized by a stoop with handrails, lighting fixtures on each side, a stone veneer watertable, and partial sidelights, creating visual interest. Two windows are located on either side of the main entrance door, with a fifth on a subsidiary roofed section that provides a side access.

In addition to the window visible from the front, the left-side elevation has a single set of shuttered windows on the main house and a single-entrance door on the subsidiary roofed section, accessed by a two-step concrete stoop, with a simple balustrade on each side. The remainder of this side elevation has no additional architectural detail.

The rear façade of the building includes a central set of glazed French doors, accessed by two steps, with a light fixture to their left, three single-panel sash windows, and a double-panel sash window. The windows on the rear façade are not framed by shutters. The right side building elevation has only two unbalanced and un-shuttered, sash windows on the left side of that façade. Additional architectural detail and articulation should be provided on all three elevations, except for the front elevation. A condition has been included in the Recommendation Section to require additional architectural elements and details that would create a more aesthetically-pleasing and visually-interesting architecture.

Additionally, as the entrances to the proposed buildings are all elevated, a barrier-free access as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) should be provided. A condition has been included in the Recommendation Section of this technical staff report.

## COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance:** The subject application has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements of the Multifamily Medium Density Residential (R-18) Zone and the site plan design guidelines of the Zoning Ordinance.
  - a. The subject application is in conformance with the requirements of Section 27-441 of the Zoning Ordinance, which governs uses in residential zones. The proposed building is accessory to the multifamily residential land use, which is permitted in the R-18 Zone.
  - b. The detailed site plan (DSP) shows a site layout that is consistent with Section 27-442, regulations regarding building setbacks, of the Zoning Ordinance.

- c. The DSP is in conformance with the applicable site design guidelines contained in Section 27-274, as crossed referenced in Section 27-283 of the Zoning Ordinance.
8. **The 2010 Prince George’s County Landscape Manual:** The Urban Design Section has reviewed the subject project in accordance with the requirements of the 2010 *Prince George’s County Landscape Manual* (Landscape Manual) and reached the following conclusions:
  - a. The application is exempt from Section 4.1, Residential Requirements, of the Landscape Manual pursuant to Section 1.1(e)(2), because the proposed gross floor area (GFA) of the “Community Building” is less than 5,000 square feet.
  - b. The plans submitted for the project also demonstrate conformance with Section 4.2, Requirements for Landscape Strips along Streets; and Section 4.9, Sustainable Landscaping Requirements. However, the plan cannot meet the requirements of Section 4.3(c)(2), Parking Lot Interior Planting Requirements and Section 4.6, Buffering Development from Streets. An Alternative Compliance Application, AC-13007, for partial relief from Section 4.3(c)(2)(A)–(C) and Section 4.6, was received and reviewed by the Alternative Compliance Committee, and recommended for approval by the Planning Director and the substance of the recommendation will be presented at the public hearing for the project.
9. **The Prince George’s County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance:** In an e-mail dated April 4, 2013, the Environmental Planning Section stated that the site is exempt from the requirements of the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance as there were no previously approved tree conservation plans for the site.
10. **The Prince George’s County Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance:** The applicant has provided a tree canopy coverage schedule pursuant to the requirements of Section 25-128, Tree Canopy Coverage Requirements. This site is required to provide 72,326 square feet of tree canopy coverage. This application has met and exceeded the requirement by providing 72,352 square feet of canopy coverage area. Therefore, the application is in conformance with the requirements of the Tree Canopy Coverage 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 Section**—In a memorandum dated March 25, 2013, the Historic Preservation Section stated that the subject application would have no effect on identified historic sites, resources, or districts.
  - b. **Archeological Review**—In a memorandum dated April 8, 2013, the archeology planner coordinator stated that a Phase I archeological survey would not be required for the subject project, as a search of current and historic photographs, topographic and historic maps, and the locations of currently known archeological sites indicates the probability of archeological sites within the subject property is low. Further, she stated that the proposal would not impact any historic sites, historic resources, documented properties, or known archeological sites.
  - c. **Community Planning Division**—In a memorandum dated May 1, 2013, the Community Planning Division offered the following:

This application is consistent with the 2002 *Prince George's County Approved General Plan* Development Pattern policies for the Developed Tier and conforms to the land use recommendations of the 2010 *Approved Subregion 4 Master Plan and Adopted Sectional Map Amendment* (Subregion 4 Master Plan and SMA).

In analyzing the project under the guidance of the General Plan, the Community Planning Division stated that the subject property is located in the Developed Tier. The vision for the Developed Tier is a network of sustainable, transit-supporting, mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented, medium- to high-density neighborhoods.

With respect to the Subregion 4 Master Plan and SMA, the subject project is in Planning Area 75A in the community of Suitland, and that the land use envisioned for this area is "Residential-High," which is defined as densities higher than 20 dwelling units per acre.

Further, with respect to aviation, the Community Planning Division stated that this property is within the Joint Base Andrews (JBA) Interim Land Use Control (ILUC) area. The property is located in Imaginary Surface E, which establishes a height Limit of 393.15 feet above the runway surface. This property is outside of the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour, so noise attenuation is not required. As the property is not in an accident potential zone, no controls on use or density are required. These categories do not prevent any of the proposed development, but should be noted on the DSP. A condition has been included in the Recommendation section of this report to require the applicant to provide a site plan note regarding the site's location in the JBA ILUC.

In conclusion, they stated that there are no master planning issues identified with this application.

**Comment:** A recommended condition of this technical staff report would require that the applicant add the above information regarding its status in the JBA ILUC.

- d. **Transportation Planning Section**—In a memorandum dated April 2, 2013, the Transportation Planning Section offered the following review comments:

The site is subject to the general requirements of site plan review, which include attention to parking, loading, and on-site circulation; although no specific traffic-related findings are required.

Further, noting that the site is accessed by an existing driveway entrance on Suitland Road (MD 218), the Transportation Planning Section stated that the proposed building would be served by this entrance, the existing internal road of Regency Park Court and existing parking spaces, though minor changes to the handicapped parking spaces and some general restriping is proposed. They also offered that there are no adjacent master plan roadways, that right-of-way is properly depicted on the site plan 60 feet from the centerline of MD 218 and 40 feet from the centerline of Regency Parkway, and that there are no outstanding traffic issues or conditions connected with the subject project. In closing, the Transportation Planning Section stated that there is no vehicular access to Regency Parkway and the existing parking, and on-site circulation is adequate to serve the proposed community building. They further stated that the site plan is acceptable from a transportation planning perspective.

- e. **Subdivision Review Section**—In a memorandum dated April 23, 2013, the Subdivision

Review Section offered the following:

The property is known as Parcel A and is located on Tax Map 89 in Grid A-2, measures 11.06 acres in size, and is located in the R-18 Zone (Multifamily Medium Density Residential). The property is currently improved with 241 garden-style apartment units. The applicant has submitted a DSP for the construction of a community building consisting of 2,505 square feet of gross floor area.

Parcel A was recorded in Plat Book WWW 57-20 on July 21, 1965. The bearings, distances, and acreage on the site plan are consistent with the record plat, which does not contain any notes.

Based on available aerial photographs (PGAtlas), the apartments were constructed between 1965 and 1977. Pursuant to Section 24-111(c)(3) of the Subdivision Regulations, the applicant is exempt from the requirement of filing a preliminary plan of subdivision because the development is in addition to development in existence prior to January 1, 1990, and does not exceed 5,000 square feet of floor area.

The Subdivision Review Section suggested that a proposed condition be included in the Recommendation Section of this technical staff report that would require, prior to certificate approval of the DSP, the plat reference in Note 2 be corrected to “WWW 57, page 20” from WWW 37, page 20.

**Comment:** The Subdivision Review Section’s proposed condition has been included in the Recommendation Section of this technical staff report.

- f. **Trails**—In an e-mail dated April 26, 2013, the senior trails planner stated that there are sidewalks on Suitland Road (MD 218), Regency Parkway, and Walls Lane that surround the subject site that are adequate to provide access from and to the property from the surrounding area. Further, he stated that there are no functional bikeways or sidewalks on the adjacent public rights-of-way that would be negatively affected by the subject proposal. Noting that the DSP included curb ramp details, he offered that these are needed to provide adequate handicapped access. In conclusion, he stated that bicycle and pedestrian transportation facilities on and around the site are adequate to serve the proposed residential community center use.
- g. **Permit Review Section**—In a memorandum dated April 8, 2013, the Permit Review Section offered numerous comments that were either addressed by revisions to the plans or included as conditions in the Recommendation Section of this technical staff report.
- h. **Prince George’s County Health Department**—In a memorandum dated April 26, 2013, the Prince George’s County Health Department, Office of Environmental Engineering, offered the following:
  - (1) The site is adjacent to an arterial roadway where elevated levels of traffic noise can be expected. Noise can be detrimental to health with respect to hearing impairment, sleep disturbance, cardiovascular effects, psycho-physiologic effects, psychiatric symptoms, and fetal development. The applicant should provide details regarding modifications, adaptations, and/or mitigation as necessary to minimize the potential adverse health impacts of traffic noise on the susceptible population.



- (2) The proposed new community building could be expected to result in increased sewage flows from the property, and the site is located in the Broad Creek sewer basin. The applicant should provide documentation indicating WSSC's (Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission) capacity for conveyance of sewage from the proposed project.
- (3) During the construction phases of this project, no dust should be allowed to cross over property lines and impact adjacent properties. Indicate intent to conform to construction activity dust control requirements as specified in the 2011 Maryland Standards and Specifications for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control.
- (4) During the construction phases of this project, noise should not be allowed to adversely impact activities on the adjacent properties. Indicate intent to conform to construction activity noise control requirements as specified in Subtitle 19 of the Prince George's County Code.

**Comment:** See Findings 11(i)(6) and 11(m) for a complete analysis of noise impacts and WSSC comments regarding the subject project. Proposed conditions in the Recommendation section of this technical staff report would require that the applicant include comments (3) and (4) above in the general notes of the subject DSP.

- i. **Environmental Planning Section**—In an e-mail dated April 4, 2013, the Environmental Planning Section stated that they had reviewed the subject application, found no issues with the project and proposed no recommended conditions, but offered the following:

- (1) The site is exempt from the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance because there is no previously approved tree conservation plan for the site. Further, the site has a valid woodland conservation exemption letter.
- (2) The site does not have an approved natural resources inventory. A natural resources equivalency letter is needed, as a grading permit is required for the subject project.

**Comment:** A valid natural resources inventory equivalency letter has since been received by staff from the applicant.

- (3) There are no wetlands, streams, or 100-year floodplain located on the subject site.
- (4) There are no impacts to the primary management area proposed by the subject project.
- (5) Though there is a small area of network gap (2005 Approved Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan) adjacent to Regency Parkway, it is not located proximate to the subject project.
- (6) Though Suitland Road is an arterial roadway adjacent to the site, no new residential units are proposed, so noise will not be evaluated for the subject project.

- (7) There are no scenic or historic roadways located adjacent to the site.
  - (8) There are no Marlboro clay soils present on the subject site.
  - (9) The subject project is not located in a transit district overlay zone.
- j. **Prince George’s County Fire/EMS Department**—In a memorandum dated May 9, 2013, the Prince George’s County Fire Department offered information regarding needed accessibility, private road design, and the location and performance of fire hydrants.
- k. **Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T)**—In a memorandum dated April 29, 2013, DPW&T stated that the proposed site development is consistent with approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan 1407-2012-00 dated March 19, 2012. Additionally, with respect to the roads adjacent to the project, DPW&T stated that:
- Any improvements within the right-of-way would have to be designed in accordance with DPW&T specifications and standards, ADA requirements, and the County Road Ordinance.
  - Compliance with DPW&T’s utility policy is required.
  - Conformance with DPW&T’s street tree and lighting standards is required.
  - Sidewalks are required along all interior roadways.
  - Storm drainage systems and facilities must be designed in accordance with DPW&T specifications and standards.
  - An access study is needed to determine the adequacy of the access point.
  - A soils investigation report is required.
- Comment:** DPW&T’s requirements will be met through their own permitting process. However, the construction of a 2,503-square-foot community/leasing office building for an existing multifamily complex may not trigger the need for all of the above requirements.
- l. **Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA)**—In an e-mail received March 28, 2013, SHA stated that they had no objection to the proposed development.
- m. **Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)**—In a memorandum dated March 26, 2013, WSSC offered the following comments regarding the subject project:
- (1) WSSC comments are made exclusively for this plan review based on existing system conditions at this time. We re-evaluate the design and system conditions at the time of application for water and sewer service.
  - (2) The applicant must coordinate with other buried utilities and shall conform with the following:

- (a) The WSSC Pipeline Design Manual pages G-1 and G-2 for utility coordination requirements must be followed.
  - (b) No structures of utilities (manholes, vaults, pipelines, poles, conduits, etc.) are permitted in the WSSC right-of-way unless specifically approved by WSSC.
  - (c) Longitudinal occupancy of WSSC rights-of-way by other utilities is not permitted.
  - (d) Proposed utility crossings of WSSC pipelines or rights-of-way that do not adhere to WSSC's pipeline crossing and clearance standards will be rejected at design plan review as per WSSC Pipeline Design Manual, Part Three, Section 3.
  - (e) Failure to adhere to WSSC crossing and clearance standards may result in significant impacts to the development plan including impacts to proposed street, building, and utility layouts.
  - (f) The applicant must provide a separate utility plan to ensure that all existing and proposed site utilities have been properly coordinated with existing and proposed WSSC facilities and rights-of-way.
  - (g) Upon completion of the site construction, utilities that are found to be located within or in conflict with WSSC rights-of-way or pipelines must be removed and relocated at the applicant's expense.
- (3) Forest conservation easements are not permitted to overlap WSSC existing or proposed easements. Potential impacts to existing forest conservation easements (due to proposed water and/or sewer systems) must be reviewed and approved by county staff.
  - (4) Unless otherwise noted, all extensions of WSSC systems require a request for hydraulic planning analysis and need to follow the system extension permit (SEP) process. The applicant should contact WSSC's Development Service Center by phone or find guidance to the process on the WSSC website.

As design review comments, WSSC offered the following:

- (1) Water service piping four inches in diameter or larger, or sewer piping six inches or larger, or pressure sewer systems, shall be designed and submitted through the site utility process. Smaller lines shall be governed by the plumbing permit process.
- (2) Remove landscaping from the existing WSSC right-of-way (easement) for the meter vault.
- (3) Provide a 30-foot-wide clear area adjacent to the existing right-of-way to allow for future replacement of the meter, vault, and associated piping.

**Comment:** WSSC’s comments regarding removing landscaping from and providing a 30-foot-wide clear area adjacent to the WSSC right-of-way (easement) is a matter solely between the WSSC and the applicant and is therefore not conditioned in this technical staff report.

- n. **Potomac Electric Power Company (PEPCO)**—In an e-mail dated April 29, 2013, PEPCO stated that they had no comments on the subject project at the present time.
13. Based on the foregoing and as required by Section 27-285(b)(1) 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. Section 27-285(b)(4) also requires that the regulated environmental features have been preserved and/or restored in a natural state to the fullest extent possible, in accordance with the requirements of Section 24-130(b)(5) of the Subdivision Regulations. Since the site contains no regulated environmental features, the finding required by Section 27-285(b)(4) of the Zoning Ordinance need not be made in this case.

## RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the foregoing evaluation and analysis, the Urban Design staff recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and APPROVE Detailed Site Plan DSP-12051 and Alternative Compliance AC-13007 for Andrews Ridge Apartments, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Prior to certificate of approval of the detailed site plan (DSP), the applicant shall:
  - a. Include in the general notes on the plan:
    - (1) The following statements:
      - (a) “The subject property is in the Joint Base Andrews (JBA) Interim Land Use Control (ILUC) area. Further, the property is within Imaginary Surface E, establishing a height Limit of 393.15 feet above the runway surface. This property is outside of the 65 dBA noise contours, noise attenuation is not required. The property is not in an Accident Potential Zone, so no controls on use or density are required. These categories do not prevent any of the proposed development, but have been included in the general notes for informational purposes.”
      - (b) “During the construction phases of this project, no dust should be allowed to cross over property lines and impact adjacent properties. The applicant intends to conform to construction activity dust control requirements as specified in the 2011 Maryland Standards and Specifications for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control.”
      - (c) “During the construction phases of this project, noise should not be allowed to adversely impact activities on the adjacent properties. The applicant intends to conform to construction activity noise control requirements as specified in Subtitle 19 of the Prince George’s County Code.”

- (2) Zoning notes pertaining to the nonconforming.
- (3) A note stating that the existing 1,267-square-foot bath house shall remain to be utilized as storage and office for the maintenance operations on the property.
- b. Correct the plat reference in Note 2 to read “WWW57, page 20” instead of “WWW 37, page 20.”
- c. Provide building dimensions either on the detailed site plan or on a footprint of the building included on the template sheet.
- d. Indicate the height of the community building on the detailed site plan.
- e. Label the existing bath house “to remain” and the use.
- f. Replace the chain-link fence with a six-foot-high fence constructed of a non-white, non-wood, low-sheen, durable product.
- g. Provide barrier-free access to the building in accordance with the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).
- h. Revise the architecture of the proposed building to be reviewed and approved by the Planning Board or its designee as follows:
  - (1) The stone watertable provided on the front façade of the building shall be carried around to the sides and rear of the building.
  - (2) The sidelights shall be extended from the midpoint down to the floor level on either side of the entrance door.
  - (3) A roofed element or portico shall be provided over the stoop at the front entranceway, to offer further architectural definition and afford protection from the elements.
  - (4) The rear façade design shall be improved to include shutters for all windows, sidelights extended on either side of the double doors in the back, and a lighting fixture placed on either side of the double doors.
  - (5) The left side elevation shall be improved by the addition of a single shuttered window to the left of the entrance door and a second set of shuttered windows on the main house block, to the left of the subsidiary roofed element that provides entrance on this façade.
  - (6) The right side elevation shall be improved by the addition of shutters to the two windows provided and additional windows and/or other architectural features.
- i. Include on the plans all existing rights-of-way and easements including easements for the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC) along the project’s Suitland Road frontage.