

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 March 16, 2017 regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-16030 for JSF Largo, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** With the subject detailed site plan (DSP), the applicant proposes to construct a building with 134,439 square feet of consolidated storage and 4,965 square feet of commercial space and to modify the list of permitted uses to allow the consolidated storage use on the subject property as authorized by Section 27-548.26(b) of the Prince George’s County Zoning Ordinance.
2. **Development Data Summary:**

	EXISTING	APPROVED
Zone(s)	M-U-I/ D-D-O	M-U-I/D-D-O
Use	Bank and Commercial Retail	Bank, Commercial Retail and Consolidated Storage
Acreage	10.94	10.94
Lot	1	1
Total gross floor area (sq. ft.)	18,632	158,036 (139,404 proposed)

OTHER DEVELOPMENT DATA

Parking Requirements per 2013 Largo Town Center Sector Plan and SMA

The following table outlines the parking that is required within the Largo Town Center D-D-O Zone for the proposed development:

Use	Description	Minimum Required	Maximum Allowed	Total Provided
Commercial – 4,965 square feet (Retail or General Office)	Min. 3.00/1000 square feet Max. 4.00/1000 square feet	15	19	16
Consolidated Storage – 980 units	1.0/50 storage units having access only from within a building*	20	N/A	21
Accessory Office to Consolidated Storage – 1,064 square feet	4.0/1,000 square feet of office space*	5	N/A	5
Total Parking		37	N/A	42 (Including 40 standard and 2 van accessible handicapped)

Note: *The Largo Town Center Sector Plan and SMA does not have a requirement for the number of parking spaces for a consolidated storage use; therefore, parking is proposed per Section 27-568 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Loading Required:** **7 spaces**
 Consolidated Storage Use - 134,439 sq. ft.
 @ 2 spaces for first 10,000 sq. ft. 2 spaces
 + 1 space per each additional 40,000 sq. ft. 4 spaces
 General Retail – 4,965 sq. ft.
 @ 1 space for 2,000-10,000 sq. ft. 1 space

Loading Proposed: **2 spaces****
 2 spaces at 15 ft. x 45 ft. x 13.5 ft.** 2 spaces

Note: **The Largo Town Center Sector Plan and SMA does not have specific requirements for the number of loading spaces or the loading space size; therefore, Sections 27-582 and 27-578, respectively, of the Zoning Ordinance serve as the requirements. The applicant seeks departures from both of these requirements per Section 27-548.25(e), which does not require separate applications for such departures, but requires that the Planning Board find that the departure conforms to all of the applicable development district standards. The DSP proposes two loading spaces, internal to the building, as opposed to the seven loading spaces required by the Zoning Ordinance, and a loading space size of 15 feet by 45 feet by 13.5 feet, instead of the 12 feet by 45 feet by 15 feet required by the Zoning Ordinance. The number and size of the loading spaces conform to all of the applicable

D-D-O Zone standards. The reduced number and size of the loading spaces will contribute to the development district vision of pedestrian-friendly, concentrated, mixed-use development in this area. Therefore, the Planning Board approved these two departures.

3. **Location:** The subject property is located in the northwestern quadrant of the intersection of Arena Drive and MD Route 202. The site is in Planning Area 73, Council District 6. The site is zoned Mixed-Use-Infill (M-U-I) and is subject to the Development District Overlay (D-D-O) Zone standards in the 2013 *Approved Largo Town Center Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (Largo Town Center Sector Plan and SMA).
4. **Surrounding Uses:** The subject site is surrounded by properties within the D-D-O Zone. Immediately to the north are an existing office building and the Kaiser Permanente medical office building in the M-U-I Zone; to the west, beyond Apollo Drive, is a U.S. Post Office in the M-U-I Zone; to the south, beyond Arena Drive, is the Largo Town Center commercial shopping center in the Major Activity Center (M-A-C) Zone; and to the east, across MD 202, is vacant property in the Reserved Open Space (R-O-S) Zone.
5. **Previous Approvals:** The property was the subject of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-89129 (PGCPB Resolution No. 89-407), approved by the Planning Board on August 3, 1989. The property is also the subject of record plat NLP 150@83. The subject property, Lot 2, was then the subject of detailed site plan approvals DSP-02034 (PGCPB Resolution No. 02-177), DSP-02034-01 (Planning Director approved), DSP-02034-03 (PGCPB Resolution No. 05-201), DSP-02034-04 (PGCPB Resolution No. 06-184), DSP-02034-05 (PGCPB Resolution No.06-240), and DSP-02034-07 (Planning Director approved). At that time of those approvals, the property was in the I-3 Zone. The site was rezoned to M-U-I as part of the 2013 Largo Town Center Sector Plan and SMA. Details of those applications are as follows:

Case	Description	Status
DSP-02034	Rough grading and infrastructure	Built
DSP-02034-01	Revision to infrastructure	Built
DSP-02034-03	4,068-square-foot bank with drive-through	Built
DSP-02034-04	15,000-square-foot sit-down restaurant	Not Built/ Valid until 12/31/17
DSP-02034-05	14,564-square-foot drug store (Rite Aid)	Built
DSP-02034-07	Removing parking spaces from bank site	Built

The subject property also has an approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan 41085-2016-00, dated November 29, 2016 and is valid until November 29, 2019.

6. **Design Features:** The applicant proposes to develop an approximately 69-foot-high, six-story, 139,404-square foot, rectangular, mixed-use building with 980 consolidated storage units, all of which are accessed internally, and 4,965 square feet of commercial/retail space. The proposed

building is located in the northwest corner of Lot 2, north of a common private drive that runs through the middle of the larger property. Just south of the private drive is the existing Wells Fargo Bank, developed under DSP-02034-03 and 07, and to the east of that is the Rite Aid commercial retail building, developed under Detailed Site Plan DSP-02034-05.

The proposed mixed-use building sits within 90 feet of Apollo Drive to the west and approximately 34.5 feet from the northern property line of Lot 2. Two driveway entrances to the south, off of the internal private drive on the lot, provides access to the parking, which is located at both the east and west end of the building. Access to the one-way, drive-through loading area, within the first floor of the building is provided along the southern and northern sides of the site and screened with overhead doors. Six-foot-high, black, ornamental, aluminum picket fencing, with a gate, and black, vinyl-coated chain-link fencing encloses the parking area east of the building, which will be for the consolidated storage customers only. The more decorative fence is used where it will be visible from Apollo Drive and the internal drive, with the chain-link fencing along the eastern and northern edges. However, there is a D-D-O standard (pg. 164) stating that chain-link fencing shall not be permitted. Therefore, a condition is included in this approval requiring the fence to be revised. Micro-bioretenention facilities are provided around the building to accommodate stormwater, and a brick-veneered dumpster enclosure is located to the northeast of the building. A small seating area, with decorative pavers, is located between the building's main entrance and the Apollo Drive right-of-way. However, no proposed seating was shown within this area. Therefore, a condition has been included in this approval requiring this to be added.

Architecture—The proposed mixed-use building is a six-story building with a flat roof. The commercial space is on the first floor of the west elevation, facing Apollo Drive, and is finished with storefront windows, doors and fabric awnings surrounded by cast stone veneer. The five upper floors on the west elevation, which will be consolidated storage use, are finished in a combination of red brick veneer on the three prominent sections, as well as regular windows, and then painted red and cream exterior insulation finishing system (EIFS) on the two recessed sections. The south elevation, which faces the internal drive, is finished in a similar fashion on all floors, but the storefront windows and doors are limited to the western end of the first floor where the commercial space and accessory office to the consolidated storage use are located. The remainder of this first-floor southern elevation is finished in cast stone veneer with an overhead door for access to the drive-through loading area. The eastern and northern elevations are almost the same in design, with the first floor finished with cast stone veneer and little fenestration except for metal access doors and the overhead access door for the loading area on the northern elevation. On the upper floors, both elevations feature just two prominent sections finished mainly in EIFS, with some brick veneer surrounding, and some windows only within the western portion of the northern elevation.

Signage—The applicant submitted a sign plan that includes freestanding and building-mounted project identification signage. The applicant is proposing one freestanding sign located just north of the internal drive. It will be a six-foot-high, 50-square-foot, aluminum cabinet sign with polycarbonate panels bearing the consolidated storage franchise name, “CubeSmart” in white and red and will be externally illuminated. Three building-mounted signs with the brand logo for the

consolidated storage use are proposed. The one near the top of the west end of the building along the southern elevation will be 119 square feet, internally illuminated red channel letters stating “CubeSmart.” Two signs are proposed near the top of the western elevation at either end. At the northern end is a 119-square-foot “CubeSmart” in internally illuminated red channel letters and at the southern end is a 120-square-foot “Self Storage” in internally illuminated red and white channel letters. Finally, building-mounted signage for the commercial uses are provided in the form of white painted graphics on the fabric awnings, with options including along the edge at 7.4 square feet each and along the top surface at 38 square feet each for all six awnings, although the final number is dependent on the tenants. The applicant should include on the sign detail sheet the correct D-D-O Zone required calculation and allowable square footage. The applicant is requesting an amendment to the applicable D-D-O Zone sign standard for the area of building-mounted signage, which is discussed in Finding 7(e) below. At the Planning Board hearing, the applicant presented an exhibit showing revisions to the details of the proposed freestanding and building-mounted signage without changing the proposed total area of the signs. The Planning Board found to support these revisions; therefore, a condition is included in this approval requiring the sign details to be revised per the applicant’s exhibit.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **The 2013 Approved Largo Town Center Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment and the standards of the Development District Overlay (D-D-O) Zone:** The 2013 *Approved Largo Town Center Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (Largo Town Center Sector Plan and SMA) defines long-range land use and development policies, detailed zoning changes, design standards, and a D-D-O Zone for the Largo Town Center. The land use concept of the sector plan divides the entire area into five distinct subareas: the Northwest Quadrant, the Northeast Quadrant, the Southeast Quadrant, the Southwest Quadrant (TOD Core), and East Area (East of Landover Road). The subject property is located in the Northeast Quadrant.

The overall vision for the Largo Town Center includes a high-density, mixed-use core bordered to the north by an expanded government services district and health-related activities. Medium- to high-density residential development rings the sector area’s southeast quadrant between Arena Drive and Harry S Truman Drive, east of Lottsford Road.

Section 27-548.25(b) of the Zoning Ordinance requires that the Planning Board find that the site plan meets the applicable development district standards in order to approve it. The development district standards are organized into multiple categories: Building Form, Existing Residential, Architectural Elements, Sustainability and the Environment, and Streets and Open Spaces. Many standards do not apply to the subject application as it is not located within the TOD Core and does not propose any new or reconfigured streets. In accordance with the D-D-O Zone review process, modification of the applicable development district standards is permitted, but the Planning Board must find that the alternative development district standards will benefit the development and the development district and will not substantially impair implementation of the Sector Plan.

If approved with conditions, the subject application will conform to all of the recommendations and requirements, except for those from which the applicant has requested an amendment. In areas where the Planning Board approved the amendment, they found that granting of the amendment will not substantially impair implementation of the Largo Town Sector Plan.

The applicant requests amendments of the following development district standards:

a. **Urban Design Criteria/Build-to Line** (page 135)

9. BTLs shall be located within 15 feet back from the Pedestrian Zone, and the full width from face of curb to building front should not exceed 25 feet.

Discussion: The proposed building sits approximately 95–105 feet from the face of curb along Apollo Drive. The applicant submitted that the additional setback was to allow for retail parking, drive aisle and sitting area between the building and right-of-way. They justified this due to the larger setback established by existing development on both sides of Apollo Drive and the fact that the ground floor commercial space along this frontage requires convenient parking to be successful.

The applicant stated that the commercial space requires convenient parking at the front of the building, which necessitates a greater building setback. In addition, the proposed layout is consistent with the prevailing pattern established by existing development. The Planning Board found that the proposed commercial space has specific parking requirements to be successful and acknowledges the existing development pattern of the commercial park. For these reasons, the Planning Board approved the amendment request.

b. **Architectural Design Criteria/Building Form** (page 156)

1. Buildings should predominantly define the perimeter of the block and be generally continuous along the BTL or front setback.

Discussion: As stated in the previous amendment request, the proposed building is setback further than the front (build-to-line) BTL to accommodate retail parking, drive aisle and sitting area between the building and right-of-way.

The Planning Board approved the amendment request for an increased front BTL; therefore, the Planning Board approved this amendment request. The building is predominant along the adjusted front BTL.

c. **Architectural Design Criteria/Building Form** (page 159)

Fenestration

1. **The relationship between solid building wall and openings (fenestration) is critical; the ratios should vary according to use and shall be calculated per elevation and floor to-floor:**

Percentage of openings (windows and doors)

Ground Floor Retail: 60-95

Ground Floor Other

Commercial/Institutional: 40-90

Ground Floor Residential: 15-40

Upper Floor Commercial/Institutional: 40-90

Upper Floor Residential: 15-60

Discussion: The highest percentage of openings in the proposed building is 39 percent along the ground floor retail on the west elevation. The remaining floor and façades vary from zero to 17 percent; however, this is for the building area of the consolidated storage use, which does not fall into any of the categories listed.

The Planning Board found that a consolidated storage use has limitations to the amount of fenestration that is appropriate as high-visibility of internal storage unit doors would not be desirable. The required standard also does not allow for lesser fenestration on lower visible elevations. Given that a large percentage of fenestration is provided along the ground-floor commercial area, the only area where it is appropriate, the Planning Board approved this amendment request.

d. **Architectural Design Criteria/Building Materials and Elements** (page 162)

4. **The use of EIFS on an exterior wall above 22 feet (measured vertically from grade) may be allowed subject to the approval of the Planning Board. However, the use of EIFS on an exterior wall within 22 feet of grade is not permitted. When used, the color(s) of the EIFS should be complimentary, but not identical, to adjacent materials.**

Discussion: The proposed building uses EIFS on an exterior wall within 16 feet of the grade on all sides of the building. The colors of the proposed EIFS is complimentary to the adjacent materials. The applicant states that given the proposed use on the first floor is not that high, it places EIFS within 22 feet of the ground.

The Planning Board found that a consolidated storage use has certain design limitations and that the proposed EIFS starting 16 feet high above the grade is sufficient to ensure that it will not come in contact with pedestrians or vehicles. For these reasons, the Planning Board approved the amendment request.

e. **Parking Design Criteria/ Surface Parking Lots and Structured Parking Garages**
(page 165)

1. **All surface parking lots or structured parking garages shall be accommodated mid-block or below grade and screened from the public realm. Structured parking should be located internal to blocks or below grade.**
2. **Surface parking lots are not permitted in the TOD core with the exception of dedicated surface parking for a hospital or medical office building. Surface parking between the front of a building and the street or open space right-of-way is prohibited within the Largo Town Center DDOZ.**
4. **In instances where surface parking lots front a street or public plaza, square, or green, the parking shall be set back a minimum of 40 feet from the BTL. Landscaping, screening, and buffering of surface parking lots shall conform to the Landscape Manual requirements.**

Discussion: The DSP proposes a surface parking lot that is above grade between the front of a building and the street and is not setback 40 feet from the BTL. The applicant justifies that surface parking is needed to allow for stormwater management and that the location of the proposed parking lot is similar to that of all other existing adjacent developments. Additionally, given the low parking requirement, structured parking is not feasible and the majority of the proposed parking is located behind the building. As discussed above, having some parking in front of the building, and consequently within 40 feet of the BTL, is necessary to make the commercial portion of the building successful.

The Planning Board found that structured parking for a 42-space parking lot is not a feasible option. Further, the Board concurred that commercial space needs to have specific surface parking spaces to be successful and acknowledged the existing development pattern of the commercial park. Given the design requirements and surrounding existing development, the Planning Board found the requested amendments to be appropriate and reasonable and therefore, the Planning Board approved the amendment requests.

f. **Signage Design Criteria/ General Provisions** (page 170)

5. **The total sign area allowed per building shall be computed on the basis of two square feet of sign area for each one linear foot of building frontage. Where a building has multiple frontages, the allowed sign area should be distributed proportionally along each building frontage. Buildings with less than 60 linear feet of building frontage may be allowed up to 120 square feet of sign area.**

Discussion: The building frontage along Apollo Drive is 155 feet, allowing for 310 square feet of sign area under this standard. Depending on the awning sign option chosen, the maximum area of building-mounted signage proposed is 586 square feet. The applicant explains that while the signs meet all other standards of the D-D-O Zone an increased area is necessary to allow for sufficient signage near the top of the building along its two major frontages, to the west and south respectively.

The Planning Board found that, given the height of the building, it's positioning on the lot, and the potential multiple users, it is necessary to have a larger signage area to provide adequate identification to customers. Therefore, the Planning Board approved the amendment requests.

8. **Zoning Ordinance:** The DSP application has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements of the Mixed-Use-Infill (M-U-I) Zone, and the requirements of the Development District Overlay (D-D-O) Zone and the site design guidelines of the Zoning Ordinance as follows:

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

(c) **A Detailed Site Plan may not be approved unless the owner shows:**

1. **The site plan meets all approval requirements in Part 3, Division 9;**
2. **All proposed uses meet applicable development standards approved with the Master Plan, Sector Plan, Transit District Development Plan, or other applicable plan;**

The site plan meets all site design guidelines and development standards of the Largo Town Center Sector Plan, except for those alternative standards as discussed in Finding 7 above.

3. **Proposed uses on the property will be compatible with one another;**
4. **Proposed uses will be compatible with existing or approved future development on adjacent properties and an applicable Transit or Development District; and**

The application proposes a mix of consolidated storage and commercial/retail uses in a vertical mixed-use format on a lot with an existing bank and a commercial retail use. The proposed uses on the subject property will be compatible with each other and will be compatible with the existing development on this lot and the adjacent properties due to the similar and complementary uses.

- 5. Compatibility standards and practices set forth below will be followed, or the owner shows why they should not be applied:**
- (A) Proposed buildings should be compatible in size, height, and massing to buildings on adjacent properties;**
 - (B) Primary façades and entries should face adjacent streets or public walkways and be connected by on-site walkways, so pedestrians may avoid crossing parking lots and driveways;**
 - (C) Site design should minimize glare, light, and other visual intrusions into and impacts on yards, open areas, and building façades on adjacent properties;**
 - (D) Building materials and color should be similar to materials and color on adjacent properties and in the surrounding neighborhoods, or building design should incorporate scaling, architectural detailing, or similar techniques to enhance compatibility;**
 - (E) Outdoor storage areas and mechanical equipment should be located and screened to minimize visibility from adjacent properties and public streets;**
 - (F) Signs should conform to applicable Development District Standards or to those in Part 12, unless the owner shows that its proposed signage program meets goals and objectives in applicable plans; and**
 - (G) The owner or operator should minimize adverse impacts on adjacent properties and the surrounding neighborhood by appropriate setting of:**
 - (i) Hours of operation or deliveries;**
 - (ii) Location of activities with potential adverse impacts;**

- (iii) **Location and use of trash receptacles;**
- (iv) **Location of loading and delivery spaces;**
- (v) **Light intensity and hours of illumination; and**
- (vi) **Location and use of outdoor vending machines.**

The applicable D-D-O Zone has multiple compatibility standards and guidelines regarding building placement, orientation, design, lighting, outdoor storage and signage. A detailed discussion of the DSP's conformance with these standards is included in Finding 7 above.

- b. The DSP is in general conformance with the applicable site design guidelines as referenced in Section 27-283 and contained in Section 27-274 of the Zoning Ordinance. For instance, vehicular and pedestrian circulation are designed to be safe, efficient, and convenient for both pedestrians and drivers with the parking lot located to the rear and side of the structure. Streetscape amenities contribute to an attractive, coordinated development that is appropriately scaled for user comfort. Additionally, the public spaces are designed to incorporate sitting areas and are readily accessible to potential users.

c. **Development District Overlay Zone Required Findings**

Section 27-548.25 Site Plan Approval

- (a) **Prior to issuance of any grading permit for undeveloped property or any building permit in a Development District, a Detailed Site Plan for individual development shall be approved by the Planning Board in accordance with Part 3, Division 9. Site plan submittal requirements for the Development District shall be stated in the Development District Standards. The applicability section of the Development District Standards may exempt from site plan review or limit the review of specific types of development or areas of the Development District.**

The DSP has been submitted in fulfillment of the above requirement.

- (b) **In approving the Detailed Site Plan, the Planning Board shall find that the site plan meets applicable Development District Standards.**
- (c) **If the applicant so requests, the Planning Board may apply development standards which differ from the Development District Standards, most recently approved or amended by the District Council, unless the Sectional Map Amendment text specifically provides otherwise. The Planning Board shall find that the alternate Development District Standards will benefit the**

development and the Development District and will not substantially impair implementation of the Master Plan, Master Plan Amendment, or Sector Plan.

In response to Section 27-548.25(b) and (c) of the Zoning Ordinance, the applicant requests that the Planning Board apply six development standards which differ from the development district standards. The Planning Board found that the alternate development district standards will benefit the development and will not substantially impair implementation of the 2013 *Approved Largo Town Center Sector Plan and SMA*, given the property's location and site constraints.

- (e) **If a use would normally require a variance or departure, separate application shall not be required, but the Planning Board shall find in its approval of the site plan that the variance or departure conforms to all applicable Development District Standards.**

The applicant has asked for a departure from the required number of the loading spaces and size. See Finding 2 for further discussion.

- d. Section 27-548.26(b) regarding the addition of permitted uses in the M-U-I Zone by a property owner—The relevant portions of that section are included in **boldface** type below followed by comment:

(b) **Property Owner.**

- (1) **A property owner may request that the District Council amend development requirements for the owner's property, as follows:**

- (B) **An owner of property in the Development District may request changes to the underlying zones or the list of allowed uses, as modified by the Development District Standards.**

(2) **The owner's application shall include:**

- (A) **A statement showing that the proposed development conforms with the purposes and recommendations for the Development District, as stated in the Master Plan, Master Plan Amendment, or Sector Plan; and**

- (B) **A site plan, either the Detailed Site Plan required by Section 27-548.25 or a Conceptual Site Plan.**

- (3) Filing and review of the application shall follow the site plan review procedures in Part 3, Division 9, except as modified in this Section. The Technical Staff shall review and submit a report on the application, and the Planning Board shall hold a public hearing and submit a recommendation to the District Council. Before final action the Council may remand the application to the Planning Board for review of specific issues.**
- (5) The District Council may approve, approve with conditions, or disapprove any amendment requested by a property owner under this Section. In approving an application and site plan, the District Council shall find that the proposed development conforms to the purposes and recommendations for the Development District, as stated in the Master Plan, Master Plan Amendment, or Sector Plan, and meets applicable site plan requirements.**

The subject application complies with the above requirements. The subject property is located in the development district created by the Largo Town Center Sector Plan and SMA, and the application seeks to change the list of allowed uses as authorized by Section 27-548.26(b) of the Zoning Ordinance. Further, both a statement of justification and a site plan have been submitted in accordance with (2)(A) and (B) above. The application proposes to build a mixed-use building on a lot with multiple existing uses, and to add the consolidated storage use as a permitted on the subject property.

The proposed addition of the requested use does not interfere with the purposes expressed on pages 5 and 6 of the Largo Town Sector Plan. The purposes include promoting and facilitating transit-oriented development around the Largo Town Center Metro Station in order to maximize transit ridership, revitalize the area through economic development while maintaining its socioeconomic diversity, and to adopt a sustainable development pattern that is conducive to its designation as a metropolitan center. The subject property is more than one-half mile from the metro station and the proposed DSP will add to the economic diversity of the sector plan area. The addition of the proposed use would also not impinge on the vision for the D-D-O Zone to articulate vibrant and diverse neighborhoods, an efficient multimodal transportation system, sustainable and accessible environmental infrastructure, and pedestrian- and bicyclist-friendly urban design. The proposed development impacts only 2.27 acres of the larger 10.94-acre legal lot. This leaves a large portion of the lot to have the potential to be developed with other diverse office and institutional uses. The addition of the proposed use would not inhibit realization of the vision of a major institutional or governmental user within walking distance of the metro station. In addition, approval of the proposed use would not interfere with the recommendations for land use contained within the sector plan, as large portion of the lot remains available for development, and would preserve the economic viability of the subject property by adding another use.

Lastly, in accordance with the last portion of this requirement, the application conforms to the purposes and recommendations for the development district, except for the amendments requested by the applicant as discussed in Finding 7 above.

9. **The requirements of Preliminary Plan 4-89129 and Record Plat:** The subject site (Lot 2, Block C) is part of the larger Capital Commerce Park approved in the 1980s as part of Preliminary Plan 4-89129 (PGCPB Resolution No. 89-407) and recorded in Plat Book NLP 150 at Plat 83. At that time, the site was in the 1-3 (Planned Industrial/Employment Park) Zone. The following conditions of the PPS, shown in **bold** below, warrant discussion:

1. **Compliance with all conditions of approved SP-87168/01, and in conformance with SP-87168/01.**

The subject application is an amendment to this previously approved site plan. Because the property is now the subject of a new zone, M-U-I and D-D-O, this site plan supersedes the previous site plan for the proposed development.

2. **The following note shall be placed on the Final Plat of Subdivision:**

“The architectural plan submitted for building permit application for the development of this site shall comply with the following requirements:

- a. **Address the provision of specific, up-to-date security hardware such as adequate deadbolt locks.**
- b. **Any breaking and entering, thefts or vandalism at the construction site shall be reported immediately upon knowledge of such crimes. Construction equipment/trailers shall be in a central location and fenced. Subsequent to any breaking and entering, the developer/builder shall be required to fully alarm all points of access (windows and doors) to the construction office/trailer(s), and implement any reasonable crime prevention measures recommended by the Police Department to help prevent future occurrences.**
- c. **Ground floor units of office buildings shall be alarmed with adequate intrusion alarms. Consideration should be given to alarms for individual suites.**
- d. **All appliances, electrical fixtures, carpeting, plumbing fixtures and cabinets shall be stored in secured construction trailers or in secured buildings.**

Conformance with this condition will have to be demonstrated at the time of relevant permit applications.

3. Development of this site must be in accordance with the approved Conceptual Stormwater Management Plan, CSD #87288.

The applicant submitted an approved stormwater management concept letter with this application; however, at the time of this approval, the Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE) had not submitted comments on the application. Therefore, a condition requires that, prior to certification, the applicant provide documentation from DPIE that the DSP is in conformance with the approved stormwater management concept plan.

4. The following note shall be placed on the Final Plat of Subdivision:

“Ingress/egress from/to Landover Road (MD Route 202) and Arena Drive is prohibited.”

No access points are proposed from MD 202 or Arena Drive.

5. Development shall be limited to 300,000 square feet of general office development or any other amount of development, which would generate no more than 580 AM peak hour vehicular trips and 537 PM peak hour vehicular trips.

As part of the approved caps stated above, there has been development of a post office (20,000 square foot), a drive-in bank (4,068 square feet), and a pharmacy with drive-through (14,564 square feet). A 15,000-square-foot restaurant has also been approved, but it is not yet built. Using the most appropriate trip generation rates obtained from the latest Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) *Trip Generation Manual* (the 9th Edition), the following table shows the proposed development along with existing and approved, but not yet built, peak-hour trips:

Development Quantity	Status	AM Peak Vehicle Trips	PM Peak Vehicle Trips
20,000 sq. ft. post office	Built	165	225
4,068 sq. ft. bank	Built	49	99
Less for pass-by trips			-47
15,000 sq. ft. restaurant	Approved	162	148
Less for pass-by trips	Not Built		-64
14,564 sq. ft. pharmacy	Built	50	144
Less for pass-by trips			-71
134,500 sq. ft. of mini warehouse and 5,000 sq. ft. of retail.	Proposed	37	87
Less for pass-by trips			-18
Total		463	503

The applied pass-by trip rates (i.e., trips that are already using the adjacent roadways and accessing the uses) are reasonable and consistent with published information in the Planning Board's Guidelines. As the table above demonstrates, the site is still within the trip cap of 580 AM and 537 PM peak-hour trips with the approval of the subject site plan.

10. **Prince George's County Landscape Manual:** Per page 127 of the Largo Town Center Sector Plan and SMA states that "if a development standard is not covered in the plan area D-D-O Zone, the applicable sections of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* (Landscape Manual) shall serve as the requirement." The provisions of the Landscape Manual regarding Commercial and Industrial Landscaped Strip Requirements (Section 4.2) are superseded by requirements for a Tree Zone, therefore, the Landscape Plan schedule for 4.2 should be deleted. The DSP is subject to the requirements of Section 4.3, Parking Lot Requirements; Section 4.4, Screening Requirements; Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses; and Section 4.9, Sustainable Landscaping Requirements, of the Landscape Manual.
 - a. **Section 4.3.1, Parking Lot Requirements**—Requires parking areas over 7,000 square feet have planted perimeters adjacent to legal property lines. The applicant has provided a schedule for this section along the eastern edge; however, this is not a property line, but rather a condominium land unit line. Therefore, this section is not applicable and the schedule should be removed from the plan. A condition has been included in this approval requiring this to be corrected prior to certification.
 - b. **Section 4.3.2, Parking Lot Requirements**—Requires that a certain amount of interior planting be provided in parking areas over 7,000 square feet. The correct schedule was provided on the landscape plan demonstrating conformance with the requirement of this section.
 - c. **Section 4.4, Screening Requirements**—Requires that loading and maintenance areas be screened from residential properties and public streets, that trash facilities be completely concealed, and that all mechanical equipment be screened from adjacent properties, streets and parking facilities. The applicant is providing a trash enclosure for the proposed dumpster, the proposed loading spaces are located internal to the building behind overhead doors, and the proposed transformer is screened by the proposed evergreens.
 - d. **Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses**—Section 4.7 requires a bufferyard between adjacent incompatible land uses, which includes the existing commercial use to the north. The correct schedule was provided on the landscape plan demonstrating conformance with the requirement of this section.
 - e. **Section 4.9, Sustainable Landscaping Requirements**—Requires that a percentage of the proposed plant materials be native plants. A schedule demonstrating conformance with the requirement has been provided. However, the Plant Schedule does not indicate native species and the number of plants do not match those listed in the Section 4.9 schedule. A

condition has been included in this approval requiring these errors to be corrected prior to certification.

- f. **Section 4.10, Street Trees Along Private Streets**—Section 4.10 provides specifics for the planting of street trees along private streets, which are defined as roads, rights-of-way, or easements along which development is authorized pursuant to Subtitle 24. Therefore, it is not applicable to the internal private drive on Lot 2 as this was not approved as an official accessway as part of the PPS approval. Therefore, a condition has been included in this approval requiring this schedule to be removed.
11. **Prince George’s County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance:** This site is subject to the provisions of the Prince George’s County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance (WCO) because the property is greater than 40,000 square feet in size and it contains more than 10,000 square feet of existing woodland. A Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCP2II-023-95-04) has been submitted for review with this application.
 - a. **Tree Conservation**—The woodland conservation worksheet shows a gross-tract area of 10.94 acres, and on-site floodplain area of 1.98 acres. The net tract was originally forested with 6.39 acres and the floodplain was originally forested with 1.72 acres. The site has a woodland conservation threshold of 1.34 acres and a total woodland conservation requirement of 5.48 acres, based on clearing a cumulative total of 6.20 acres. The previously approved Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCP2II-023-95-03) provided 0.50 acre of on-site preservation. The current plan shows the requirement being met with 0.19 acre of preservation, 0.62 acre of fee-in-lieu and 4.67 acres of credits for off-site mitigation, on another property. No on-site woodland reforestation is proposed with this submittal.

The TCP2II can be found in conformance with the WCO, with minor revisions. Required revisions have all been included as conditions in this approval.
 - b. **Specimen Trees**—Effective October 1, 2009, the State Forest Conservation Act was amended to include a requirement for a variance if a specimen, champion, or historic tree is proposed to be removed. This State requirement was incorporated in the adopted Prince George’s County Code effective on September 1, 2010.

Section 25-122(b)(1)(G) of the WCO requires that “Specimen trees, champion trees, and trees that are part of a historic site or are associated with a historic structure shall be preserved and the design shall either preserve the critical root zone of each tree in its entirety or preserve an appropriate percentage of the critical root zone in keeping with the tree’s condition and the species’ ability to survive construction as provided in the Technical Manual.”

The original NRI for the property, NRI-057-06, approved on May 17, 2006, identified two tulip poplar trees of significant size, but not qualifying as specimen trees. With 10 years of growth, these trees, which measured 28 inches and 30 inches diameter at breast height in 2006, have achieved specimen tree status, as reflected in the letter received from the applicant on March 15, 2017. The limits of disturbance on the DSP show that these two specimen trees (ST-1 and ST-2) are to be removed. Therefore, a Subtitle 25 Variance Application and a statement of justification in support of a variance were also received on March 15, 2017.

Section 25-119(d) of the WCO contains six required findings to be made before a variance can be granted. The letter of justification addresses the required findings for both specimen trees together because of their proximate location, same species, and relatively similar conditions. The Planning Board reviewed the variance application at the hearing on March 16, 2017 and found to approve the request based on the applicant's justification for the six required findings, as summarized below:

(A) Special conditions peculiar to the property have caused the unwarranted hardship;

The applicant submitted that a special condition, which is peculiar to the subject property, is that it is zoned M-U-I and is subject to the development constraints contained in the Largo Town Center Sector Plan. While Lot 2 in its entirety consists of 10.9 acres, the property has been subject to a land condominium consisting of a number of individual land units. Land Unit 4A for the development is quite narrow. Because of the minimum height requirement, the building requires surface parking on three sides; therefore, the entire land unit needs to be graded. The two specimen trees in question are proposed to be removed as a result of necessary grading and the installation of stormwater management facilities. In fact, the approved stormwater management concept necessitates ponds being established in the exact location of the two specimen trees.

(B) Enforcement of these rules will deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by others in similar areas;

If the applicant is forbidden from removing the two specimen trees as requested, they will be prevented from implementing a reasonable development on the property within its M-U-I zoning classification which will achieve the minimum height requirements as specified by the Largo Town Center Sector Plan. Thus, the applicant will be prevented from enjoying rights commonly enjoyed by other property owners who also own property zoned M-U-I within the sector plan area, but which are not impacted by specimen trees.

(C) Granting the variance will not confer on the applicant a special privilege that would be denied to other applicants;

The purposes of the M-U-I Zone, as set forth in Section 27-546.15 of the Zoning Ordinance, encourage a mix of residential and commercial uses as “infill development in areas which are already substantially developed.” Virtually all of the land area in close proximity to the property has been developed. Allowing these trees to be taken down will not grant the applicant a special privilege denied to others. Given the articulated purposes of the M-U-I Zone as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance, any other applicant, when faced with a similar circumstance for property which is zoned M-U-I, would likely be granted a similar variance given a similar set of facts. Further, the applicant in this case is not seeking a special privilege. The applicant is merely attempting to achieve a reasonable development of its property as envisioned by the M-U-I Zone and the sector plan.

(D) The request is not based on conditions or circumstances which are the result of actions by the applicant;

The applicant submits that the facts set forth above equally apply to this criterion of the variance standard. Once again, the purpose and development regulations of the M-U-I Zone and the sector plan requirements envision an infill development. This, combined with the unique shape of the property, make it impractical to develop the property without removing these specimen trees.

(E) The request does not arise from a condition relating to land or building use, either permitted or nonconforming, on a neighboring property; and

While development has occurred on condominium Land Units 1 and 2, the applicant had no involvement in the development of those properties. The use of these land units does not cause the request for this variance. However, the fact that Land Units 1 and 2 have been developed does help to create the unique situation which presents itself to the applicant in development their land unit.

(F) Granting of the variance will not adversely affect water quality.

The granting of this variance will in no way affect water quality. The property will be served by public water and sewer within a closed system. Furthermore, development of the property will occur in strict conformance with the County’s new stormwater management regulations. Therefore, granting the variance will have no adverse impact on either surface water, ground water, or waste water.

The Planning Board found that the required findings of Section 25-119(d) have been adequately addressed by the applicant for the removal of Specimen Trees ST-1 and ST-2. Conditions have been included in this approval requiring the addition of the standard specimen tree and variance labeling and notes to the TCPII.

12. **Prince George's County Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance:** The DSP is subject to the requirements of the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance. Section 25-128 of the County Code requires a minimum percentage of tree canopy coverage (TCC) on properties that require a grading permit. Properties zoned M-U-I are required to provide a minimum of ten percent of the gross tract area in tree canopy coverage.

	REQUIRED	PROPOSED
Tree Canopy	47,655 sq. ft.	47,816 sq. ft.

The overall legal lot has a gross tract area of 10.94 acres and, as such, a TCC of 1.09 acres, or 47,655 square feet, is required. The submitted landscape plan provides a worksheet indicating that this requirement will be addressed through the preservation of 0.19 acre of existing trees and the proposed plantings of this DSP, and the existing plantings implemented per DSP-02034-05 and DSP-02034-07, for a total of 47,816 square feet of provided TCC. The correct TCC schedule for the entire legal lot should be provided on the DSP format, signed and dated by a licensed landscape architect. A condition has been included in this approval requiring this prior to certification.

13. **Further Planning Board Findings and Comments from Other Entities:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:
- a. **Historic Preservation**—A search of current and historic photographs, topographic and historic maps, and locations of currently known archeological sites indicates the probability of archeological sites within the subject property is low. This proposal will not impact any historic sites, historic resources or known archeological sites.
 - b. **Community Planning**—The *Plan Prince George's 2035 Approved General Plan* (Plan Prince George's 2035) designates the area as a Regional Transit District, characterized by moderate- to high-density and intensity. A destination for regional workers and residents that contains a mix of office, retail, entertainment, public and quasi-public, flex and medical uses; walkable, bikeable, and well-connected to a regional transportation network. Density and intensity noticeably greater within a quarter mile of Metro and light rail stations.

The 2013 *Approved Largo Town Center Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* placed the development site within the Largo Town Center Northeast Quadrant area and recommends mid-rise mixed-use office and institutional development for the site. The Largo Town Center Sector Plan recommends mixed-use (office/institutional) land use on

the subject property. This application is for a consolidated storage facility on a portion of a larger site recommended for mixed-use (office/institutional). Consolidated storage is not permitted in the M-U-I/D-D-O Zone. The sector plan envisions office and institutional uses to contribute to the daytime population needed to keep the existing retail establishments vibrant.

Although the consolidated storage use will not generate the daytime employment envisioned to keep the nearby retail establishments vibrant, it proposes ground level retail, and generally meets the height and design standards prescribed in the D-D-O. As a result, this application does not substantially impair the implementation of the sector plan. Opportunity still exists for office/institutional uses to be developed on the remaining legal lot area.

- c. **Transportation Planning**—The Planning Board reviewed an analysis of the DSP’s conformance with the transportation-related PPS conditions, which is incorporated into Finding 9 above. They also found that access to, and circulation within, the site are acceptable, and the site plan is in conformance to most applicable transportation-related D-D-O standards.

Overall, the Planning Board found that the proposed detailed site plan as submitted is in conformance with all applicable development standards and guidelines, and meets the required findings for a detailed site plan as described in Section 27-285 of the Zoning Ordinance.

- d. **Subdivision Review**—The Planning Board reviewed an analysis of the site plan’s conformance with Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-89129, that is incorporated into Finding 9 above. They also reviewed the following plan comments:

- (1) The plan shall be revised to include the entirety of Lot 2, Block C with bearings and distances and acreage.

The plan has been revised as requested.

- (2) All reference to the condominium plat and land units should be removed.

The revised plan still includes references to the condominium land units; however, they have been minimized so as not to be confused for a division of the legal lot.

- (3) The bearings and distance around the private drive should be removed as this is not a division of the property and was not dedicated to public use by the record plat.

The plan has been revised as requested.

- (4) All internal bearings and distances representing the land units should be removed and conformance with all zoning requirements shown for the entirety of Lot 2.

The revised plan still includes bearings and distances of the condominium land units; however, they have been minimized so as not to be confused for a division of the legal lot. The plan has been revised to show conformance with all Zoning requirements for the entirety of Lot 2.

- e. **Trails**—The Planning Board has reviewed the submitted DSP application for conformance with the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* (MPOT) and the 2013 *Approved Largo Town Center Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (area master plan) in order to implement planned trails, bikeways, and pedestrian improvements.

The MPOT and the area master plan include no master plan trail or bikeway recommendations that impact the subject site. However, both the MPOT and area master plan emphasize the importance of Complete Streets with bicycle and pedestrian access for sites near transit. The Complete Streets section of the MPOT includes the following policies regarding sidewalk construction and the accommodation of pedestrians which relate to frontage improvements and internal pedestrian circulation on the site:

POLICY 1: Provide standard sidewalks along both sides of all new road construction within the Developed and Developing Tiers.

POLICY 2: All road frontage improvements and road capital improvement projects within the Developed and Developing Tiers shall be designed to accommodate all modes of transportation. Continuous sidewalks and on-road bicycle facilities should be included to the extent feasible and practical.

An existing sidewalk is along the site's frontage of Apollo Road. This sidewalk should be upgraded to meet the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) Road Specifications and Standards, if necessary and required by the Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE). The submitted site plan also reflects a standard sidewalk along the private drive that abuts the site. Sidewalk access is provided around the perimeter of the building and sidewalks are shown from both Apollo Drive and the private drive to the building entrance. The site also includes an inverted-U bicycle rack sufficient to accommodate five bicycles along the western building elevation. The TDDP includes the following guidance regarding bicycle parking in Parking Design Criteria 9 (page 165), which is copied below:

9. **Bicycle parking should be provided in structured parking garages and surface parking lots based on a site-by-site needs basis. Appropriate location, number of racks, and level of access for each facility depends on the**

anticipated use of the site or building. Conformance to LEED or similar federal, state, and county bicycle parking criteria is strongly encouraged.

The provided bicycle parking was found to be appropriate for the needs of the proposed development.

- f. **Permit Review**—Permit review comments have either been addressed through revisions to the plans or through conditions included in this approval.
- g. **Environmental Planning**—The Planning Board reviewed a discussion of the DSP’s conformance with the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance as discussed in Finding 11 above, and the following additional comments:
 - (1) **Site Description:** The subject property is located with frontage on the west side of Apollo Drive and the east side of Landover Road (MD 202), in Largo. The site is located within the Southwest Branch of the Patuxent River Basin. According to the Sensitive Species Project Review Area (SSPRA) map prepared by the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Program, there are no rare, threatened, or endangered (RTE) species found to occur on or in the vicinity of this property. Landover Road (MD 202) is identified as historic. The site is located within the Environmental Strategy Area One (formerly the Developed Tier) and part of the Largo Town Center Metro Regional Transit District of the Regulated Environmental Protection Areas Map as designated by *Plan Prince George’s 2035 Approved General Plan*. According to the 2005 *Approved Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan*, none of the three network features (Regulated Areas, Evaluation Areas and Network Gaps) are present on the site.
 - (2) **Natural Resources Inventory:** The application has an approved Natural Resource Inventory Equivalency Letter (NRI-EL), NRI-057-06-01, signed on July 22, 2016. The NRI verifies that the TCPII and the Detailed Site Plan will not result in any significant changes to the previously approved TCPII.
 - (3) **Noise:** The current proposal is to construct a commercial use. No residential uses are proposed. Noise mitigation analysis and mitigation is not required at this time.
 - (4) **Soils:** The predominant soils found to occur according to the US Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) Web Soil Survey (WSS) include Urban land-Collington-Wist complex, 0-5 percent slopes) and Widewater and Issue soils (frequently flooded). Based on available information, Marlboro clay is not mapped on or near this property.

- (5) **Stormwater Management:** A Stormwater Management Concept Approval Letter (41085-2016-00) and associated plan were submitted with the application for this site. The approval was issued on November 29, 2016, from the Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE). The approved plan proposes on-site water quality controls with micro-bioretenion and bioretention swales. A stormwater management fee is required in-lieu of fully providing on-site attenuation/quality control measures.
- h. **Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department**—In a memorandum dated February 10, 2017, the Office of the Fire Marshal provided standard comments regarding fire apparatus, hydrants, and lane requirements. Those issues will be enforced by the Fire/EMS Department at the time of issuance of permits.
- i. **Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE)**—DPIE did not provide any comments on the subject application. Therefore, a condition has still been included in this approval requiring that, prior to certification, documentation be provided from DPIE that the DSP is in conformance with the approved stormwater concept plan.
- j. **Prince George's County Police Department**—The Police Department did not offer comments on the subject application.
- k. **Prince George's County Health Department**—In a memorandum dated February 22, 2017, the Environmental Engineering Program of the Health Department offered the following comments and recommendations:
- (1) During the demolition/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.
- A condition is included in this approval that addresses this comment.
- (2) During the demolition/construction phases of this project, no noise should 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.
- A condition is included in this approval that addresses this comment.
- l. **Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA)**—In an e-mail received on February 15, 2017, SHA indicated that the current access to the site is via a County-owned Road.

- m. **Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)**—In an e-mail dated February 1, 2017, WSSC provided comments relating to water and sewer service that will be required prior to issuance of WSSC permits.
 - n. **Verizon**—Verizon did not offer comments on the subject application.
 - o. **Potomac Electric Power Company (PEPCO)**—PEPCO did not offer comments on the subject application.
14. As required by Section 27-285(b)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance, the DSP, as approved with conditions, will represent a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines of Subtitle 27, Part 3, Division 9, of the County Code without requiring unreasonable cost and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.
15. Per Section 27-285(b)(4) of the Zoning Ordinance, which became effective on September 1, 2010, a required finding for approval of a detailed site plan is as follows:
- (4) The Planning Board may approve a Detailed Site Plan if it finds that the regulated environmental features have been preserved and/or restored in a natural state to the fullest extent possible in accordance with the requirement of Subtitle 24-130(b)(5).**
- The Planning Board found that the regulated environmental features on the subject property have been preserved and/or restored in a natural state to the fullest extent possible, provided the floodplain area has been addressed on the TCPII worksheet. A condition has been included in this approval requiring this.
16. The subject application adequately takes into consideration the requirements of the D-D-O Zone and the 2013 *Approved Largo Town Center Sector Plan and SMA*. The amendments to the development district standards required for this development would benefit the development and the development district as required by Section 27-548.25(c) of the Zoning Ordinance, and would not substantially impair implementation of the sector plan.

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 further:

- A. RECOMMENDS to the District Council that the addition of consolidated storage use to the list of permitted uses of the 2013 *Approved Largo Town Center Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* for the subject property be APPROVED.

- B. APPROVED the alternative development district standards for:
1. **Urban Design Criteria/Build-to Line (page 135):** To permit a build-to line of 95 to 105 feet.
 2. **Architectural Design Criteria/Building Form (page 156):** To permit the building to be predominant along the increased build-to line.
 3. **Architectural Design Criteria/Building Form (Page 159):** To allow the percentage of fenestration as shown in the approved elevations, which is between zero and 39 percent.
 4. **Architectural Design Criteria/Building Materials and Elements (page 162):** To allow for exterior insulation finishing system within 16 feet of the grade of the site.
 5. **Parking Design Criteria/ Surface Parking Lots and Structured Parking Garages (page 165):** To allow the surface parking as proposed on the plan, between the front of the building and the street and within zero feet of the build-to line.
 6. **Signage Design Criteria/General Provisions (page 170):** To allow the total sign area of building-mounted signs to be 586 square feet.
- C. APPROVED Detailed Site Plan DSP-16030 and Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII-023-95-04 for JSF Largo, including departures to the number of loading spaces and their height, with the following conditions:
1. Prior to certification, the detailed site plan (DSP) shall be revised, or additional information shall be provided, as follows:
 - a. Add site plan notes as follows:

“During the demolition and construction phases, this project will conform to construction activity dust control requirements as specified in the 2011 Maryland Standards and Specifications for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control.”

“During the demolition and construction phases, this project will conform to construction activity noise control requirements as specified in the Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR).”
 - b. Provide all building dimensions on the site plan.
 - c. Revise the DSP to correctly identify and demonstrate all of the approved development district standard amendments and departures.

- d. Provide documentation from the Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement that the DSP is in conformance with the approved stormwater management concept plan.
- e. Provide details for the proposed aluminum picket fencing and retaining walls, in conformance with all applicable Development District Overlay Zone (D-D-O) standards. Remove the proposed chain-link fencing from the plan.
- f. Provide details and locations for seating and trash amenities within the seating area.
- g. Provide the correct Development District Overlay Zone (D-D-O) calculation and allowable/proposed square footages for the entire sign area on the sign detail sheet.
- h. The Type II tree conservation plan (TCP II) shall be revised as follows:
 - (1) Show the limits of the on-site floodplain on the plan and provide a symbol in the legend.
 - (2) Identify all woodland clearing in the floodplain and provide a symbol in the legend.
 - (3) Revise Standard Note 6 to state that the property is within "Environmental Strategy Area One (formerly the Developed Tier) of the Regulated Environmental Protection Areas Map as designated by *Plan Prince George's 2035 Approved General Plan*."
 - (4) Provide a new Environmental Planning Section approval block with corrected numbering.
 - (5) Indicate the specimen trees on the plan and provide the standard table.
 - (6) Provide the standard language on the plan and in the notes of the variance approval.
 - (7) Have the revised plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared it.
- i. The following revisions shall be made to the landscape plan:
 - (1) The schedules for Sections 4.2, 4.3-1, and 4.10 shall be deleted.
 - (2) Label the native plants in the plant list.

- (3) The Section 4.9 schedule and plant schedule shall indicate the same number and type of plant material proposed.
 - (4) Provide the correct tree canopy coverage schedule on the plan.
 - j. Amend the sign detail sheet, which appears as DSP-13, to include the signage revisions as they appear on Applicant's Exhibit 1.
2. Prior to signature approval of the Type II tree conservation plan (TCPII) for this property, pursuant to Section 25-122(d)(1)(B) of the Prince George's County Code, all woodland preserved, planted, or regenerated on-site shall be placed in a woodland conservation easement recorded in land records and the liber/folio of the easement shall be indicated on the TCPII. The following note shall be placed on the TCPII:

“Woodlands preserved, planted, or regenerated in fulfillment of woodland conservation requirements on-site have been placed in a woodland and wildlife habitat conservation easement recorded in the Prince George's County Land Records at Liber ____ folio____. Revisions to this TCPII may require a revision to the recorded easement”.

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.

* * * * *

PGCPB No. 17-51
File No. DSP-16030
Page 29

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 Geraldo, seconded by Commissioner Doerner, with Commissioners Geraldo, Doerner, Bailey and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioner Washington absent at its regular meeting held on Thursday, March 16, 2017, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 6th day of April 2017.

Patricia Colihan Barney
Executive Director

By Jessica Jones
Planning Board Administrator

PCB:JJ:JK:rpg