



Note: Staff reports can be accessed at www.mncppc.org/pgco/planning/plan.htm.

Detailed Site Plan

DSP-00004/01

Application	General Data
<p>Project Name: Walker Mill Business Park (Royal USA Tours)</p> <p>Location: On the eastern side of Hazelwood Drive, approximately 700 feet north of its intersection with Rochell Avenue in Capitol Heights.</p> <p>Applicant/Address: Hazem El Samahy 14625 Baltimore Avenue Laurel, MD 20743</p>	Date Accepted: 4/24/2008
	Planning Board Action Limit: 7/3/2008
	Plan Acreage: 1.17
	Zone: I-1
	Dwelling Units: NA
	Gross Floor Area: 5,780
	Planning Area: 75B
	Tier: Developed
	Council District: 7
	Municipality: Capitol Heights
200-Scale Base Map: 202SE06	

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates
Bus maintenance and operation facility	Adjoining Property Owners Previous Parties of Record Registered Associations: 3/25/2008 (CB-12-2003)
	Sign(s) Posted on Site and Notice of Hearing Mailed: 6/3/2008

Staff Recommendation		Staff Reviewer: R. Grover, A.I.C.P.	
APPROVAL	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS	DISAPPROVAL	DISCUSSION
	X		

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL
PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Detail Site Plan DSP-00004/01
Walker Mill Business Park, Royal USA Tours

The Urban Design staff has completed the review of the subject application and appropriate referrals. The following evaluation and findings lead to a recommendation of APPROVAL with conditions, as described in the recommendation section of this report.

EVALUATION

This detailed site plan was reviewed and evaluated for compliance with the following criteria:

- a. The requirements of the Zoning Ordinance in the I-1 Zone.
- b. The requirements of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-87194.
- c. The requirements of Detailed Site Plan DSP-00004.
- d. The requirements of Final Plat NLP 141@11.
- e. The requirements of the *Landscape Manual*.
- f. The requirements of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance.
- g. Referral comments.

FINDINGS

Based upon the evaluation and analysis of the subject detailed site plan (DSP), the Urban Design staff recommends the following findings:

1. **Request:** The subject application requests approval of a bus maintenance and operation facility.

2. **Development Data Summary:**

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone(s)	I-1	I-1
Use(s)	Vacant	Bus operation and maintenance facility
Acreage	1.17	1.17
Building square footage/GFA	0	5,780

OTHER DEVELOPMENT DATA

	REQUIRED	PROPOSED
Total Parking Spaces	12	17
Of which the stated number are designed for use by the handicapped	1	1
Total Loading Spaces	1	1

3. **Location:** The subject property is located on the eastern side of Hazelwood Drive, approximately 700 feet north of its intersection with Rochell Avenue in Capitol Heights.
4. **Surroundings and Use:** The subject property is surrounded by a distribution center to the south, a contractor storage yard to the east, a radio tower to the north and vacant land across the street that borders the subject property to the west.
5. **Previous Approvals:** The project is subject to the requirements of Prince George’s County Planning Board (PGCPB) Resolution No. 00-117, approving Detailed Site Plan DSP-00004. The project is also subject to the requirements of PGCPB Resolution No. 88-6, approving Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-87194 and the requirements of final plat NLP 141@11. Lastly, the project is subject to the requirements of Stormwater Management Concept Plan No. 8005270-2000-01, which was approved March 7, 2008 and is valid until March 7, 2011.
6. **Design Features:** The proposed project will be accessed at two separate locations along a landscaped Walker Mill Road frontage. Three bioretention stormwater management areas are located adjacent to the landscaped strip. Additional landscaping is provided along the northern boundary of the site adjacent to a parcel developed with a cell/radio tower. Automobile parking is provided on both sides of the building, with diagonal parking for buses provided to the rear of the site.

A “six-foot-high batten board fence” is specified for the stretch of the northern property line not enclosed by the proposed concrete retaining wall and the property’s Hazelwood Drive frontage. A detail for a white vinyl fence, however, is included on Sheet DSP-5. A recommended condition below would require that the notation on Sheet DSP-3 be corrected so that it is clear that a white

vinyl fence, not a batten board fence will be provided. The proposed fencing is intended to tie in with an existing six-foot chain-link fence on the southern boundary of the site and an existing seven-foot chain-link fence along the rear property line. Additionally, the detail shall be revised to indicate a six, not a 6½-foot fence. Lastly, by condition below, staff is suggesting that the alternative “versa-lock mosaic or approved equal” be utilized in lieu of the standard concrete retaining wall.

The proposed building measures a total of 5,780 square feet, with a two-story office area utilizing 2,494 square feet, a proposed 1,333-square-foot service bay and a 1,953-square-foot wash bay. Architecture for the project is primarily rectilinear and the office portion of the building is architecturally differentiated from the rest of the building both in form and material use. A standing seam metal roof specified as a “medium grey material” is utilized for the entire building.

More particularly, the architecture for the left side of the front elevation utilizes a “Nantucket red” ground face block on the first story for the left (office) side of the elevation, with “silversmith” corrugated metal panels utilized on its second story. The right side of the front elevation utilizes corrugated metal panels, with “Nantucket red” ground face block on its water table. The right side of the elevation is utilized for the service and wash bays. Fenestration for the left portion of the front elevation includes an entrance door, two service bay doors and nine windows in two rows (five on the second story and four on the first story). A paired set of lateral windows are located on the façade’s extreme right end. From the elevations submitted, it is unclear whether these windows are functional or faux. The height of the two service bay doors are intersected at their midpoint by a rectangular panel detail. Two lintels are provided on the office portion of the building, one spanning one pair of double windows and the other unusually spanning both the other pair of double windows and the door.

The left side elevation indicates an entrance door and three windows on the first story, with four windows above on the left “office” side of the elevation. Materials utilized for this portion of the elevation are the same as for the front. Ground face block is utilized on the office’s first story and limited to the water table on the service portion of the façade. There are no other details or design elements on the corrugated metal portion of the façade.

The right side elevation has three horizontal levels/elements and is composed of corrugated metal with “Nantucket red” ground face block on its water table. The lowest portion of the façade, which encloses the proposed wash bay, has five double-lateral windows. The second portion, rising above the proposed wash bay, encloses the service bay and has no detailing. The third element, visible because of the office portion’s height, has three double-lateral windows, similar in design to those of the wash bay element.

The rear elevation of the façade is a mirror image of the front elevation with several exceptions. Instead of two lines of windows, the office portion of the façade has windows only in its upper story and, instead of a line of windows, has a single double-lateral set of windows and one large window above a pedestrian entrance door. The door, while having a block lintel like the pedestrian entrance door on the front façade, has a much smaller window area than the front entrance door and is not centrally located in the office portion, but is located to its far left.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **Zoning Ordinance:** The subject application has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements in the I-1 (Light Industrial) Zone. The project is in compliance with the applicable

provisions of Section 27-473, Uses Permitted in Industrial Zones and the applicable provisions of Section 27-474, Regulations for Development in Industrial Zones.

8. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-87194:** Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, 4-87194, was approved by the Planning Board in PGCPB Resolution No. 88-6. The following conditions of that approval, relevant to the subject project, are indicated in **bold** face type below, followed by staff comment:

Condition 3 Detailed site plan for individual lots shall be approved by the Planning Board prior to building permits. These site plan reviews shall address, but not be limited to, the items listed in the Area Planning Division's (N/SE) memorandum dated September 16, 1987.

Comment: Should the subject detailed site plan be approved, the requirement that one be approved for the property would be fulfilled. A review addressing the items listed in the September 1987 memorandum is included in Finding 9 infra, as the design criteria suggested in that memorandum were included verbatim in the approval of Detailed Site Plan DSP-00004.

Condition 4 Provision of a dual left-turn lane at the intersection of Walker Mill Road and Addison Road as shown in the attached plan. The applicant shall also agree to provide for any modification to the existing signal when deemed necessary by the Department of Public Works and Transportation. It should be noted that, recently, the Planning Board approved the Walker Mill Towne subdivision with a similar condition.

Comment: In a memorandum dated April 23, 2008, the Transportation Planning Section stated that this modification, along with any signal modifications, is complete.

Condition 5 Provision of a third exclusive through lane on the eastbound leg of Maryland Route 458 (Silver Hill Road) at its intersection with Maryland Route 4 in accordance with State standards and shall provide for signal modification if deemed necessary.

Comment: In a memorandum dated April 23, 2008, the Transportation Planning Section stated that this modification, along with any signal modifications, is complete.

Condition 6 Provision of a 300-foot dual left-turn lane on the northbound leg of Maryland Route 4 at its intersection with Maryland Route 458 (Silver Hill Road) in accordance with State standards prior to building permit to include minor modification of existing traffic signal if deemed necessary.

Comment: In a memorandum dated April 24, 2008, the Transportation Planning Section stated that this modification, along with any signal modifications, is complete.

Condition 7 Provision of an exclusive right-turn lane in accordance with the Department of Public Works and Transportation standards on Walker Mill Road at access roads to the site, County Road and Rochelle Avenue, prior to building permit.

Comment: In a memorandum dated April 24, 2008, the Transportation Planning Section stated that it did not appear that the right-turn lane at Rochelle Avenue and County Road/Hazelwood

Drive has been completed. However, since the condition is independently enforceable as a preliminary plan condition, it has not been included as a recommended condition of the subject approval.

Condition 8 Provision of an exclusive right-turn lane and a shared through and left-turning lane on the north leg of County Road and Rochelle Avenue at their approach to Walker Mill Road prior to building permit.

Comment: In a memorandum dated April 24, 2008, the Transportation Planning Section stated that the improvements specified in the condition are complete.

Condition 9 Provision of a new traffic signal at the intersection of Walker Mill Road with County Road, when deemed necessary by the Department of Public Works and Transportation prior to the issuance of any building permits.

Comment: In a memorandum dated April 24, 2008, the Transportation Planning Section stated that the improvements specified in the condition are complete.

Condition 10 Review of a methane study by the Natural Resources Division prior to the issuance of grading permits.

Comment: A condition below would require that the applicant submit a methane study to the Natural Resources Division so that they can review it prior to the issuance of grading permits for the project.

9. **Detailed Site Plan DSP-00004:** The property in question is subject to the requirements of Detailed Site Plan DSP-00004, approved by the Planning Board on July 13, 2007 for a contractor's storage area including two "office trailers," a gravel parking lot, "bulk storage areas" for materials and construction equipment. Such approval, formalized in PGCPB Resolution No. 00-117 adopted by the Planning Board, contains the following findings relevant to the subject approval. Staff has listed each such finding in **bold** face type, followed by staff's comment.

(1) All projects within this property shall be subject to site plan review by the Prince George's County Planning Board. The site plan shall contain a landscape plan.

Comment: Should the subject detailed site plan application, which includes a landscape plan, be approved by the Planning Board, the applicant will have fulfilled this condition.

(2) The Planning Board shall review the development to assure its compliance with the following design guidelines, i.e. those contained in (3) and (4) below:

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

Comment: The subject project is not located adjacent to any of the aforementioned roadways nor does it abut any area planned or developed for residential purposes.

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

1. Minimizing the views of parking, loading, storage and service areas.

Comment: Grade differences, landscaping and locating bus parking to the rear of the proposed building will help minimize the views of parking, loading, storage and service.

2. Providing architectural elements consistent in materials and treatment on all sides, and with all mechanical equipment enclosed or screened. Screening and enclosures shall be treated as integral elements of building design.

Comment: Architectural design and material use is consistent on all façades and mechanical equipment is not visible on the exterior façades of the proposed buildings.

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

Comment: A recommended condition below would require that the proposed sign be lowered in height and landscaped in accordance with the applicable design requirements.

9. **Final Plat NLP 141@11:** In a memorandum dated May 16, 2008, the Subdivision Section stated that the detailed site plan is consistent with Record Plat NLP 141@11.
10. **Landscape Manual:** The project is subject to Sections 4.2 and 4.7 of the Prince George's County *Landscape Manual*. Staff has reviewed the submitted landscape plan and finds that it meets the requirements of the relevant sections of the *Landscape Manual*.
11. **Woodland Conservation Ordinance:** In written comments dated April 24, 2008, the Environmental Planning Section stated that the site is exempt from the requirements of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance.
12. **Referral Comments:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:
 - a. **Historic Preservation**—In comments dated April 28, 2008, the Historic Preservation Planning Section has stated that the proposed detailed site plan for a bus maintenance and operations facility will not affect any historic resources located in the vicinity of the subject site.
 - b. **Archeology**—In a memorandum dated May 9, 2008, the staff archeologist stated that a Phase I archeological survey would not be recommended on the subject property because 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 site was previously impacted by grading and mining activities and that there are no County historic sites or known archeological sites within a one-mile radius of the subject property.

- c. Community Planning**—In a memorandum dated May 23, 2008, the Community Planning South Division stated that the subject application is not inconsistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies for the Developed Tier and that the subject application conforms to the land use recommendations of the 1985 *Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Suitland-District Heights and Vicinity, Planning Areas 75A and 75B*.
- d. Transportation**—In a memorandum dated April 23, 2008, the Transportation Planning Section stated that they find the plan acceptable from the standpoint of circulation. Further, they stated that the proposal, from a trip generation standpoint, is consistent with the types of uses that were considered at the time of review of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-87194.
- e. Subdivision**—In a memorandum dated May 16, 2008, the Subdivision Section stated that the property is known as Lot 18, Block A, in the Walker Mill Business Park and is the subject of Preliminary Plan 4-87194, approved by the Planning Board (PGCPB Resolution No. 88-6) and recorded in land records in plat book NLP 141@11. They also mentioned that Conditions 3, 4–9 and 10 relate to the review of the subject detailed site plan. Please see Finding 8 for a discussion of those conditions. Further, they noted that the record plat contains three plat notes which are consistent with the applicable preliminary plan conditions. In closing, noting that the detailed site plan is consistent with record plat NLP 141@11, they stated that there are no other subdivision issues at this time.
- f. Trails**—In a memorandum dated May 6, 2008, the trails coordinator stated that there are no master plan trails issues included in the adopted and approved Suitland-District Heights and Vicinity Master Plan that impact the subject site, and that the existing sidewalk along Hazelwood Drive is accurately reflected on the submitted site plan.
- g. Permits**—In a memorandum dated April 25, 2008, the Permit Review Section offered numerous comments that have either been addressed by revisions to the plans or in the recommended conditions below.
- h. Environmental Planning**—In written comments dated April 24, 2008, the Environmental Planning Section stated that the site is exempt from the requirements of the Prince George’s County Woodland Conservation Ordinance. No issues are raised by the subject project and they have no further comment on the project.
- i. Fire/EMS Department**—In a memorandum dated May 13, 2008, the Prince George’s County Fire/EMS Department offered comment on needed accessibility, private road design and the location and performance of hydrants.
- j. Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T)**—In a memorandum dated May 20, 2008, DPW&T stated that:
- Hazelwood Drive is a County maintained 80-foot right-of-way, urban four-lane collector road. Right-of-way dedication and frontage improvements would be required in accordance with DPW&T specifications and standards, including full-width, two-inch mill and overlay, required for Hazlewood Drive along the frontage of the property.

- All improvements within the public right-of-way shall be dedicated for public use and are to be designed in accordance with the County’s Road Ordinance, DPW&T specifications and standards, and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).
 - Modifications are required to the northern end of Hazelwood Drive to accommodate the turning movements for a standard WB-40 vehicle and a standard length fire truck, assuming parking is provided on the outside edge.
 - Noting that improvements within the public right-of-way require construction permits, compliance with DPW&T’s Utility Policy would be required, including relocation or adjustments of existing utilities as necessary.
 - Conformance with DPW&T street tree, sidewalk and street lighting specifications and standards would be required with adjustments to existing light fixtures completed as necessary and new light fixtures installed matching those in the area.
 - Stormwater management facilities shall include recreation features and/or visual amenities. All storm drain systems and stormwater management facilities are to be constructed in accordance with DPW&T specifications and standards. Approval of all facilities is required prior to permit issuance.
 - A soils investigation report including a subsurface exploration and a geotechnical engineering evaluation for public streets.
 - The proposed site development is consistent with the approved DPW&T Stormwater Management Concept No. 8005270-2000-01, dated March 7, 2008.
 - DPW&T technical approval is required prior to issuance of any permits.
- k. **Maryland State Highway Administration**—In comments received April 24, 2008, the Maryland State Highway Administration stated that they had no comment on the subject project.
- l. **Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)**—In a memorandum dated May 23, 2008, WSSC asked that the applicant show how the building will be watered and sewered. Staff expects that after the requested revisions to the plans are made, WSSC will provide additional comment.
- m. At the time of this writing, the Town of Capitol Heights has not offered comment on the subject project.
- n. In an email dated June 9, 2008, the Town of District Heights stated that they had no comment on the subject project.
13. As required by Section 27-285(b), 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.

RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the foregoing evaluation, analysis and findings, the Urban Design staff recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and APPROVE Detailed Site Plan DSP-00004/01, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certificate approval of this detailed site plan, the applicant shall:
 - a. Integrate the proposed sign for the project into the six-foot-high sight-tight fence along the subject site's Hazelwood Drive frontage. Sign copy area shall be limited to 24 square feet. Final design of said sign shall be approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board. Sign location shall be indicated on both the detailed site plan and the landscape plan.
 - b. Add a note to the plans that repair and service of buses will only be performed on Royal USA Tours buses and not on those of the general public.
 - c. A five-foot perimeter landscape strip shall be provided along the eastern boundary of the subject site for bus parking or the area shall be relabeled as storage and screening shall be provided.
 - d. Specify colors for the corrugated panel siding and the standing seam metal roof that are coordinated with the color of the "Nantucket red" ground face block. Final color scheme shall be approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.
 - e. The notation indicating "proposed six-foot-high batten board fence, see Sheet DSP-3 for details," shall be revised to read "proposed six-foot-high white vinyl fence, see Sheet DSP-5 for details."
 - f. The applicant shall utilize the "versa-lock mosaic" or an approved equal alternative in lieu of a standard concrete retaining wall in a white color. Final design of the wall shall be approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.
2. Prior to the issuance of the first grading permit for the project, the applicant shall submit a methane study to the Environmental Planning Section for their review.