

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board is charged with the approval of Detailed Site Plans pursuant to Part 3, Division 9 of the Zoning Ordinance of the Prince George's County Code; and

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on November 14, 2013, regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-12061 for Franklin Park at Greenbelt Station, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The detailed site plan (DSP) is for the addition of two new freestanding monument signs, two new building-mounted banner signs, and 27 freestanding pole banner signs within an existing multifamily residential development in the Mixed Use–Infill (M-U-I) and Development District Overlay (D-D-O) Zones.

2. **Development Data Summary:**

	<b>EXISTING</b>	<b>APPROVED</b>
Zones	M-U-I/D-D-O	M-U-I/D-D-O
Use	Multifamily Residential	Multifamily Residential
Acreage	151.79	151.79
Monument Signs	9	9 (2 replaced)
Building-Mounted Banner Signs	2	2
Pole Banners	0	21

3. **Location:** The subject site is located in Planning Area 67, Council District 4, and the Developed Tier. More specifically, the site is located in the northeastern quadrant of the intersection of Breezewood Drive and Cherrywood Lane, within the City of Greenbelt. The site is zoned Mixed Use–Infill (M-U-I) and is subject to the Development District Overlay (D-D-O) Zone standards found in the 2013 *Approved Greenbelt Metro Area and MD 193 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (Greenbelt Sector Plan and SMA).
4. **Surrounding Uses:** The subject property is generally bounded to the north by the right-of-way of Edmonston Road with the Capital Beltway (I-95/495) beyond; to the east by the right-of-way of Edmonston Road with Kenilworth Avenue (MD 201) beyond; to the south by the right-of-way of Breezewood Drive with commercially developed Beltway Plaza in the M-U-I Zone and Greenbelt Middle School in the Open Space (O-S) Zone beyond; and to the west by the right-of-way of Cherrywood Lane, with the Indian Creak Stream Valley open space in the Reserved Open Space (R-O-S) Zone beyond. The existing Greenbelt Metro Station lies further to the west, beyond this open space property.
5. **Previous Approvals:** The subject property was originally developed as the Springhill Lake multifamily rental residential development in the 1960s with a total of 2,877 dwelling units. The

site remained largely the same until Conceptual Site Plan CSP-05001 was approved by the Prince George's County Planning Board on July 28, 2005 (PGCPB Resolution No. 05-180) to redevelop the entire property with a mix of uses, including multifamily residential, retail, a community building, and recreational facilities. Subsequently, Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-05082 for the proposed redevelopment was disapproved by the Planning Board on May 25, 2006 due to inadequate fire and rescue services. A Detailed Site Plan (DSP-05089), which had already been filed for the redevelopment proposal, was later withdrawn. The CSP, while still valid, does not have any bearing on the subject application which is only for new signage. Also, because of the limited scope of the proposal, no stormwater management concept approval is necessary.

6. **Design Features:** The subject property is a large conglomeration of existing parcels that form a roughly triangular shape. Public rights-of-way border all three edges and two more, Springhill Lane and Springhill Drive, bisect the existing multifamily residential development. The only improvements proposed with the subject DSP are new freestanding and building-mounted signage scattered throughout the property. No changes are proposed to uses, buildings, parking, landscaping, or any other type of site feature.

The first sign type proposed is a freestanding monument sign, of which there are nine existing on-site. Two of these, at the two aquatic centers, are to be replaced with this application. The other seven were previously replaced, in a similar style, under permits issued in 2011 prior to the approval of the 2013 Greenbelt Sector Plan and SMA. The new signs are approximately five feet, eight inches high and six feet wide and will be externally lit. They feature a gray, blue, and olive color scheme, with white lettering, and are generally rectangular in shape with an open triangle on top. They each read "Aquatic Center Franklin Park at Greenbelt Station." Both of these signs will be located internal to the property, in front of the existing aquatic centers, adjacent to parking areas and away from the public rights-of-way.

The second sign type proposed is building-mounted banners, with two existing on-site and two more proposed, each attached to a separate building. Each is generally triangular in shape and is mounted flush to each building between the upper level apartment windows and the eaves of the gable roof with no lighting. The banner is light blue in color with white lettering that reads approximately "Next right: home. RENT 866-653-9649 Franklin Park Apartments." All four of these face east and are proposed within an approximately 900-foot length of the property frontage along Edmonston Road, with the Capital Beltway (I-495/95) and Kenilworth Avenue (MD 201) beyond. No area or size was given for this sign type.

The third type of proposed sign is a freestanding pole banner, which is a colored vinyl banner mounted to an approximately 14-foot-high black, metal, decorative pole. The pole is capped with a diamond-shaped symbol, similar to the existing monument signs on-site. The colored banner, which is two feet wide by four feet high and hangs more than seven feet off the ground, continues the blue, white, and olive color scheme and reads "It's a New Day FranklinParkLiving.com." There are 27 pole banners proposed with this DSP that are distributed adjacent to all public rights-of-way throughout the site, with five along Cherrywood Lane, five along Breezewood Drive, six

along Edmonston Road extended, six along Springhill Drive, and five along Springhill Lane. No separate lighting is proposed for these signs.

The submitted DSP package also includes a detail for, and some specified locations for, a decorative street sign within the development. This type of sign, being a public noncommercial sign, is not subject to the D-D-O requirements or a DSP review. These should be removed from the plan and further coordination regarding their installation should be done with the City of Greenbelt, which has jurisdiction over the adjacent public rights-of-way.

7. **The 2013 Approved Greenbelt Metro Area and MD 193 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment and the standards of the Development District Overlay (D-D-O) Zone:** Until the final plan document is published, the 2013 *Approved Greenbelt Metro Area and MD 193 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (Greenbelt Sector Plan and SMA) consists of the 2012 preliminary plan document, Prince George's County Planning Board Resolution No. 12-109, and County Council Resolutions CR-14-2013 and CR-15-2013. These documents must be read concurrently to determine the approved plan and sectional map amendment recommendations.

The approved sector plan recommends an integrated mix of uses at Franklin Park at Greenbelt Station to include residential, park and open space, and neighborhood-scale retail and office uses. Since this DSP is limited to signage only and retains the existing mix of uses on the subject property, this application conforms to the land use recommendations of the 2013 Greenbelt Sector Plan and SMA.

The approved sector plan envisions gateways into the redeveloped Franklin Park at Greenbelt Station property at key points along Cherrywood Lane at Breezewood Drive and Springhill Drive to define key entry points and foster a sense of arrival (Strategy 2.1 on page 98).

#### **Requests to Amend Development District Standards**

The submitted application and justification materials indicate the desire to deviate from a number of development district standards to accommodate the proposed signs on the subject property. These standards are discussed below (all page numbers reference the sector plan):

**Architectural Elements: Signage (page 229)**—The applicant requests amendments to the signage standards of the D-D-O Zone to provide more than one freestanding or monument sign for a residential development exceeding 200 dwelling units and to allow for building-mounted signage that exceeds ten percent of the façade area of the commercial portion of the building. The applicant contends that the proposed signage meets the rest of the standards; however, some information regarding the areas and materials of the signs, and their setback from the nearest curb lines, is not provided on the plan to ensure their conformance to the standards. Therefore, conditions have been included in this approval requiring this information be added in order to demonstrate conformance.

With regard to the requested amendment for the number of freestanding or monument signs, the DSP application requests the replacement of two existing monument signs at the two aquatic centers on-site, in addition to the seven existing monument signs on the property that were previously permitted for replacement in 2011. The Planning Board found these two new signs acceptable as they will not be visible from any public rights-of-way and are mainly for residents and visitor way-finding purposes.

In regard to the 27 new freestanding pole banner signs, these are largely decorative in purpose and, the applicant contends, will help create a sense of community. However, the proposed number of these signs greatly exceeds the sector plan's recommendation and may actually serve to clutter the public rights-of-way and detract from the existing monument signs on-site. This is not so much of a concern along Springhill Lane and Springhill Drive, as these streets are both completely internal to the multifamily residential development and are mainly used by property residents and visitors. Of course, all of this signage could possibly be removed one day if the approved CSP for the property is pursued for development. Therefore, the Planning Board approves this amendment request for two new aquatic center monument signs and 21 freestanding pole banner signs. The quantity of 21 pole banner signs is based on inclusion of all of the ones proposed along Springhill Lane and Springhill Drive as shown on the DSP, but would be limited as follows along the outer public rights-of-way: a maximum of three along Cherrywood Lane, a maximum of three along Brezewood Drive, and a maximum of four along Edmonston Road. Additionally, pole banner signs along these frontages should be located a minimum of 500 feet from any monument sign or other pole banner sign. The 500 foot distance is based on existing block lengths along the areas where the applicant requested to place signs. The Planning Board finds that this spacing between signs, and from monument signs, will help to minimize signage clutter along the outer edges of the residential development, while still contributing to a sense of place.

With regard to the request for building-mounted signage in excess of ten percent of the façade area of the commercial portion of the building, both proposed building-mounted banners exceed the ten percent limit. One is the size of approximately 23 percent of the façade area, and the other is the size of approximately 17 percent of the façade area. These two proposed signs are in addition to two existing building-mounted banner signs, all within an approximately 900 foot stretch of road frontage. This amount of signage, oriented toward fast-moving traffic on the Capital Beltway (I-495/95), is excessive, would not benefit the development, and is contrary to the goals and strategies of the sector plan. The Planning Board finds that such signs should not be approved as permanent, but depending on the size and display period this type of sign could possibly qualify as a temporary real estate advertising sign, which is exempt from sign permit, as allowed per Section 27-602 of the Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, the Planning Board disapproves this amendment request. A condition has been included in this approval requiring the proposed building-mounted banner signs be removed from the DSP.

As far as the two existing building-mounted signs, research indicates that they were not previously permitted. They could possibly be considered real estate identification signs per Section 27-602 of the Zoning Ordinance, which reads (in part) as follows:

- (a) **Types of signs exempt from sign permit, when all applicable Design Standards of Division 3, Subdivision 3, of this Part are met:**
- (3) **Real estate, identification: Temporary signs advertising the prospective sale or lease of real estate, located on the premises being advertised.**

The referenced Division 3, Subdivision 3, includes Section 27-632, which lists design standards for real estate identification signs as follows:

- (a) **Area.**
- (1) **Maximum area - 6 square feet.**
- (b) **Location.**
- (1) **The signs shall be placed on the property being advertised.**
- (c) **Quantity.**
- (1) **Maximum number - 1 per each street frontage.**

The two existing building-mounted signs cannot be considered legal real estate identification signs under Section 27-602 because there is more than one per street frontage, as both are located facing Edmonston Road, and each is larger than 6 square feet, at approximately 250 square feet.

If the two signs are to remain on the subject property, they either have to fully meet the requirements of Section 27-632, by removing one sign and reducing the size of the remaining sign to a maximum of six square feet, or they have to be shown and approved on this DSP and fully meet all applicable D-D-O standards, as the only requested amendment to a signage standard is disapproved. The applicant indicated at the hearing that their preferred option is to redesign the existing building-mounted banner signs to meet all applicable D-D-O standards and label them as temporary, for a maximum of six months. Therefore, the Planning Board found to include a condition in this approval requiring the DSP be revised accordingly.

8. **Zoning Ordinance:** The DSP application has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements of the M-U-I Zone and the requirements of the D-D-O Zone of the Zoning Ordinance:
- a. Section 27-546.19(c), Site Plans for Mixed Uses, 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 does not meet all of the site design guidelines and development district standards of the Greenbelt Sector Plan and SMA 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 subject DSP does not propose a change of uses. The existing multifamily residential development was originally constructed in the 1960s.

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;**

The subject DSP does not propose any new buildings.

- (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;**

The subject DSP does not propose any changes to building façades or entries.

- (C) **Site design should minimize glare, light, and other visual intrusions into and impacts on yards, open areas, and building façades on adjacent properties;**

The subject DSP does not propose any change to the overall site design.

- (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;**

The subject DSP does not propose any new buildings, or changes to building materials or colors.

- (E) Outdoor storage areas and mechanical equipment should be located and screened to minimize visibility from adjacent properties and public streets;**

The subject DSP does not propose any outdoor storage areas or mechanical equipment.

- (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**

The subject DSP does request some amendments to the applicable development district standards for the signs as discussed in Finding 7 above.

- (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;**

The subject DSP does not propose any changes to the existing operations of the site.

- (ii) Location of activities with potential adverse impacts;**

The subject DSP does not propose any activities with potential adverse impacts.

- (iii) Location and use of trash receptacles;**

The subject DSP does not propose any changes to existing trash receptacles.

- (iv) Location of loading and delivery spaces;**

The subject DSP does not propose any changes to existing loading or delivery spaces.

- (v) Light intensity and hours of illumination; and**

The subject DSP does not propose any new lighting.

**(vi) Location and use of outdoor vending machines.**

The subject DSP does not propose any outdoor vending machines.

- b. Section 27-548.25(b) requires that the Planning Board find that the site plan meets the applicable development district standards in order to approve a DSP. As discussed in Finding 7 above, this DSP requests multiple amendments to applicable D-D-O Zone standards. The Planning Board found that one of the requested amendments to the development standards would benefit the development district and would not substantially impair implementation of the Greenbelt Sector Plan and SMA.
9. **The Prince George's County Landscape Manual:** The instant DSP is not subject to the requirements of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* (Landscape Manual) because it does not propose any new gross square footage or any improvements that require landscaping, and it will not require a building or grading permit.
10. **The Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance:** The subject DSP includes only signage improvements, with no grading or clearing of trees; therefore, it is not subject to the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance at this time.
11. **The Prince George's County Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance:** The subject application proposes less than 5,000 square feet of disturbance and is, therefore, exempt from the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance per Section 25-127(a)(1) of the Prince George's County Code.
12. **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. **Community Planning**—The Planning Board reviewed an analysis of the subject DSP's conformance with the D-D-O Zone as discussed in Finding 7 above.

This application is consistent with the 2002 *Prince George's County Approved General Plan* Development Pattern policies for centers in the Developed Tier. This application conforms to the land use recommendations of the 2013 *Approved Greenbelt Metro Area and MD 193 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (Greenbelt Sector Plan and SMA) for a mix of residential, park and open space, and neighborhood-scale retail and office uses. The Greenbelt Sector Plan and SMA retained the subject property in the M-U-I Zone and retained the D-D-O Zone, which requires site plan review for new development.



The subject site is not located within the Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) Interim Land Use Control (ILUC) area or the county's aviation policy areas. The vision of the General Plan is met by this application. The large existing multifamily apartment complex includes retail uses and helps fulfill General Plan policies to encourage medium- to high-density, mixed-use, transit-, and pedestrian-oriented development in the Developed Tier, to promote development of mixed residential and nonresidential uses at moderate to high densities and intensities in context with surrounding neighborhoods, with a strong emphasis on transit-oriented design as recommended for designated centers and corridors.

The applicant's statement of justification incorrectly cites the date of the current sector plan as July 2012. The Greenbelt Sector Plan and SMA was approved in March 2013. Furthermore, page two of the statement of justification inadvertently refers to the 2001 development district standards for the Springhill Lake subarea, all of which were superseded by the 2013 development district.

The applicant's coversheet contains an inconsistency between the table for "Signs Proposed Per Sheet" and General Note 7 with regard to the number of signs that are being proposed. The applicant needs to clarify how many signs are proposed with this DSP.

The proposed signage package as a whole greatly exceeds the plan's recommendation and will detract from the sense of gateways and arrivals to the larger development.

The significant number of freestanding signs proposed by this application is concerning. The approved development district standards allow for a maximum of one freestanding or monument sign for each residential development exceeding 200 dwelling units. In addition to the freestanding signs that currently exist on the subject property, the applicant is proposing more than 30 additional freestanding signs. This number greatly exceeds the signage permitted by right within the Greenbelt Metro Area and MD 193 Corridor Development District.

Additionally, the need for four building-mounted banner signs is questionable. Two such signs already exist and would seem to be sufficient to advertise the property to travelers along the Capital Beltway (I-495/95). The development district signage standards do not permit large signage oriented to the Capital Beltway unless a major employment or GSA campus is constructed in the Greenbelt Metro North Core area, and even then such signage is limited to that site. Large signs catering to fast-moving traffic on a freeway the size of the Capital Beltway are contrary to the emphasis of the sector plan and development district standards on high-quality development that enhances the pedestrian and transit-rider experience.

Some of the issues raised in this review have been addressed through conditions included in this approval as necessary. However, as discussed in Finding 7 above, the Planning Board finds that a certain amount of new freestanding signage may be provided on-site to

create the sense of place desired by the applicant, without substantially impairing the implementation of the sector plan.

- b. **Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE)**—In a memorandum dated July 19, 2013, DPIE stated that they had no objection to this project for new signage only.
- c. **Prince George’s County Police Department**—In a memorandum dated July 3, 2013, the Police Department indicated that they reviewed the DSP and there are no crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) related concerns in regards to the placement or movement of the banners and signs.
- d. **Prince George’s County Health Department**—In a memorandum dated July 19, 2013, the Environmental Engineering Program of the Health Department stated that they had no comments or recommendations on the subject application.
- e. **Potomac Electric Power Company (PEPCO)**—PEPCO did not provide comments on the subject application.
- f. **City of College Park**—The City of College Park did not provide comments on the subject application.
- g. **Town of Berwyn Heights**—The Town of Berwyn Heights did not provide comments on the subject application.
- h. **City of Greenbelt**—In a memorandum dated November 4, 2013, the City of Greenbelt indicated that their council voted unanimously to conditionally support the subject DSP on October 28, 2013. Their letter reads as follows:

While the City understands the Greenbelt Metro Area and MD 193 Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment limits free standing signs to one within the Development District Overlay Zone, the City feels the signs being proposed by Franklin Park represent a positive investment that will enhance community spirit and identity.

The City believes the pole mounted banner signs will not negatively detract from the community, and will serve to enhance the community. The City does believe that the number of pole mounted banner signs could be reduced by deleting the signs that are proposed at the intersections of public streets where there currently exist monument signs. The existing monument signs serve as gateway signs to the community, and there is no need for additional signs at these locations. The City has also worked with the applicant to redesign the poles for the banner signs to move away from a Victorian design, and to replace it with a design that is more in keeping with the modern design of the existing monument signs.

The City supports the building mounted real estate advertising banners, but believes the applicant should be limited to two, and the signs should adhere to the size requirements of the Greenbelt Metro Area and MD 193 Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment sign regulations. The City also believes the signs should be considered temporary in nature and meet the permit requirements in Section 27-618(2) of the County's Zoning Ordinance.

In conclusion, the Greenbelt City Council supports the Franklin Park DSP with the following conditions:

1. The applicant revise the design for the brackets and base of the banner signs to not include Victorian architectural elements and rather incorporate elements that respect the design of the new monument signs;
2. The DSP be revised to include two building banner signs that are to be considered temporary real estate advertising signs with limited time periods for display (i.e., 6 months at a time) and the signs be redesigned to meet the ten percent façade area requirement of the Development District Standards in the Greenbelt Metro Area and MD 193 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment;
3. The applicant submit a landscape plan for the proposed monument signs to the City at the time of permitting;
4. The DSP be revised to delete the pole mounted banner signs that are located in close proximity to existing monument signs; and
5. The applicant agrees to work with the City to identify opportunities that may exist to include reference to the City and/or city events in the seasonal banner signs.

The Planning Board found to include the City's Conditions 1 and 3 as conditions in this approval. The existing building-mounted banner sign issue in the City's Condition 2 is discussed further in Finding 7 above, with a related condition included in this approval. The spacing issue raised by the City's Condition 4 will be resolved by the adopted condition of approval requiring a minimum 500-foot spacing between pole banner signs and monument signs. Finally, the City's Condition 5 was found to be outside of the realm of this DSP, but the Board encourages the applicant to work with the City as requested.

13. The subject application, if revised as conditioned, adequately takes into consideration the requirements of the D-D-O Zone and the Greenbelt Sector Plan and SMA. One of the amendments to the development district standards, as discussed in Finding 7 above, 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.

Based on the foregoing and as required by Section 27-285(b)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance, the detailed site plan, if revised as conditioned, represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines of Subtitle 27, Part 3, Division 9, of the Prince George's County Code without requiring unreasonable cost and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Subtitle 27 of the Prince George's County Code, the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission adopted the findings contained herein and APPROVED the Detailed Site Plan DSP-12061, subject to the following conditions:

- A. The Planning Board APPROVED the alternative development district standard for:
  - 1. Page 229—A maximum of one freestanding or monument sign permitted for each residential development exceeding 200 dwelling units (to allow two new aquatic center monument signs and an additional 21 new freestanding pole banner signs).
  
- B. The Planning Board DISAPPROVED the alternative development district standard for:
  - 1. Page 229—The maximum gross area of building-mounted signage shall not exceed ten percent of the façade area of the commercial portion of the building (to allow two proposed building-mounted banners that have an area up to 23 percent of the façade area).
  
- C. The Planning Board APPROVED Detailed Site Plan DSP-12061 for Franklin Park at Greenbelt Station, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1. Prior to certification, the applicant shall revise the plans as follows or provide the specified documentation:
    - a. Revise the detailed site plan (DSP) as follows:
      - (1) Correct all notes, tables, plans, and labels to consistently indicate the number and types of signs.
      - (2) Revise Sheet 3 to remove all details for signs that are already constructed and not proposed with this DSP.
      - (3) Remove the proposed street sign detail and all reference to it on the plan and in the notes.
      - (4) Label the material, which shall be durable and high-quality, of each sign type on the plan.
      - (5) Label the area of each proposed sign on the detail sheet.

- (6) Remove the two proposed building-mounted banner signs from the plan.
- (7) Label each sign's setback from the nearest curb line, which shall be no less than two feet.
- (8) Revise the freestanding pole banner signs such that there are a maximum of three along Cherrywood Lane, a maximum of three along Breezewood Drive, and a maximum of four along Edmonston Road. Additionally, pole banner signs along these rights-of-way shall be located a minimum of 500 feet from any monument sign or other pole banner sign.
- (9) Revise the proposed pole banner signs to remove the Victorian architectural elements, and incorporate elements similar in design style to the proposed monument signs.
- (10) Provide landscape plans for the proposed monument signs, with review by the City of Greenbelt, and approval by the urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.
- (11) For the two existing building-mounted banner signs, redesign them to meet all of the applicable D-D-O (Development District Overlay) standards and label them as temporary displays, for a maximum of six months.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that an appeal of the Planning Board's action must be filed with the District Council of Prince George's County within thirty (30) days following the final notice of the Planning Board's decision.

\* \* \* \* \*

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the action taken by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner Washington, seconded by Commissioner Geraldo, with Commissioners Washington, Geraldo, Shoaff, Bailey and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, November 14, 2013, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 5<sup>th</sup> day of December 2013.

Patricia Colihan Barney  
Executive Director

By Jessica Jones  
Planning Board Administrator

PCB:JJ:JK:arj