

3. **Location:** The subject site is located in Planning Area 60, Council District 1. More specifically, the property is located at 7015 Brooklyn Bridge Road, on the south side, approximately one-half mile west of its intersection with the Capital Beltway (I-95/495).
4. **Surrounding Uses:** The subject property is bounded to the east by the public right-of-way of Leo James Court, with vacant property in the R-R Zone beyond; to the north by the public right-of-way of Brooklyn Bridge Road with a public park in the Open Space (O-S) Zone beyond; and to the west and south by single-family detached homes in the R-R Zone. Only the lots to the south are part of the Bond Mill Station Cluster Subdivision.
5. **Previous Approvals:** The property is Lot 24, Block A, of Bond Mill Station, a cluster subdivision. Lot 24, Block A, was the subject of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (PPS) 4-03103, which was approved on January 29, 2004 and recorded in Plat Book NLP 214-88. The property is subject to a minor Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, 4-15018, which was approved by the Planning Director on February 19, 2016, subject to ten conditions. The subject property has a Stormwater Management Concept Plan, 33861-2012, which was approved on October 31, 2014 and will be valid through October 31, 2017.
6. **Design Features:** The subject site consists of one rectangular existing lot fronting on the public right-of-way of Brooklyn Bridge Road to the north and the public right-of-way of Leo James Court to the east. The property is currently developed with a single-family detached residential dwelling, which is to be razed. The proposed one-story, 38-foot-high, 9,880-square-foot church building is to be located in the approximate center of the site, fronting on Brooklyn Bridge Road. Two 34-foot driveway entrances are proposed onto the site leading into the single proposed parking compound that wraps around the front and sides of the building. The entrance off Brooklyn Bridge Road is located in the northwest corner of the site and the one off Leo James Court is located in the southeast corner of the site. At the Planning Board hearing, multiple nearby property owners expressed their concerns over traffic impacts and the proposed access driveway locations. Specifically, they asked that the entrance off of Leo James Court, which is currently a residential cul-de-sac, either be removed or reduced to a one-way entrance only. The applicant proffered to create and implement a traffic management plan for before and after church services and agreed to reduce the width of the driveway off of Leo James Court to make it a one-way in, entrance-only access point. The Planning Board found to include this revision regarding the access drive in this approval. Wide landscape areas are proposed along all edges of the property and a single freestanding, four-foot-high, red brick sign with a light-emitting diode (LED) screen is proposed in the northeast corner of the property, closest to the intersection of the two roads. No building-mounted signage is proposed.

The proposed church building is rectangular and faces north towards Brooklyn Bridge Road. This elevation will include the main glass doors with an overhang, and is finished with red brick and includes a tower feature. The roof is a double-level gabled roof finished with gray asphalt shingles. The side and rear elevations include a moderate amount of fenestration, including long windows and metal access doors, and are mainly finished with a brick watertable and cream exterior insulation finishing system (EIFS) for the remainder of the façade. Given the highly-visible

residential nature of the surrounding area, the Planning Board found that this amount of EIFS is not visually appropriate and it should be changed to either siding or masonry, up to a minimum of eight feet above grade on all building elevations. Therefore, a condition in this approval requires this revision to enhance the appearance of the building and make it harmonious with the surrounding community.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance:** The subject application has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements in the R-R Zone and the site design guidelines of the Zoning Ordinance.
 - a. A church located on a lot over two acres in size is a permitted use in the R-R Zone. However, the lot was previously platted as part of a cluster subdivision that included a plat note requiring development of this property to be in conformance with Detailed Site Plan DSP-04008, as amended.
 - b. The submitted DSP is in conformance with the applicable parts of Section 27-442(b), Regulations in the Residential Zones, including lot coverage, lot width, and yard depths. The proposed building height is 38 feet, which is more than the standard 35 feet permitted; however, in accordance with this section, the minimum side yard widths have been increased accordingly with the building height.
 - c. The DSP is in conformance with the applicable site plan site design guidelines contained in Section 27-274, as cross-referenced in Section 27-283. For example, the subject development provides the majority of the parking to the sides of the structure, pedestrian access is provided into the site from the right-of-way, and grading has been designed to minimize the environmental impacts to the site.
 - d. One proposed four-foot-high, 32-square-foot, double-sided, freestanding sign is shown on the DSP, facing Brooklyn Bridge Road. The sign is in conformance with the Zoning Ordinance standards in Section 27-617, which governs institutional signs.
8. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-15018:** Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-15018 was approved to change the use on the subject lot from single-family detached, as previously approved, to the proposed church use and to demonstrate that adequate public facilities exist to serve the proposed development. The PPS was reviewed as a minor PPS due to the limited scope of the proposal and because the proposed use is allowed in the R-R Zone. Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-15018 was approved by the Planning Director on February 19, 2016, subject to ten conditions, of which the following are applicable to the review of this DSP and warrant discussion as follows:

- 1. Development of this site shall be in conformance with Stormwater Management Concept Plan 33861-2012-00 and any subsequent revisions.**

In a memorandum dated February 22, 2016, the Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE) indicated that the DSP is consistent with approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan 33861-2012.

- 2. At the time of final plat, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall grant a ten-foot-wide public utility easement (PUE) along all public streets.**

The submitted DSP shows the required ten-foot-wide public utility easement (PUE) along all public streets; further granting of the PUE will occur at the time of final plat.

- 5. Provide a sidewalk along the subject site's entire frontage along Brooklyn Bridge Road and Leo James Court. These sidewalks should be included in the subject site's road frontage improvements and are subject to modification by DPIE/DWP&T.**

The submitted DSP shows sidewalks along both frontages, but on the property instead of within the rights-of-way. Therefore, a condition has been included in this approval requiring this revision.

- 7. At the time of Detailed Site Plan, additional dedication may be required for Brooklyn Bridge Road as necessary to provide a decel lane if required by DPW&T. Any required road dedication shall be reflected on the final plat.**

In a memorandum dated February 22, 2016, DPIE indicated that the proposed entrances into the site are adequate and that the necessary rights-of-way exist along both roadways. No additional dedication is needed.

- 8. The revision to TCP2-062-05 associated with DSP-04008-08 shall show a specimen tree table that contains information regarding all specimen trees located on the entire site.**

The revised Type 2 tree conservation plan (TCP2) provided a specimen tree table as required. This is discussed further in Finding 11 below.

- 10. At least 35 days prior to any Planning Board hearing on DSP-04008-08, the applicant shall submit a variance application and Letter of Justification for the proposed removal of any specimen trees.**

A variance application and letter of justification for the proposed removal of any specimen trees has been submitted with the DSP application. This is discussed further in Finding 11 below.

9. **Detailed Site Plan DSP-04008 and its revisions:**

- a. **DSP-04008:** The Planning Board approved the original DSP application on May 19, 2005 subject to eight conditions, of which the following are relevant to the subject application:

1. Development of the subject property shall be in conformance with the limits of disturbance shown on the approved TCPII. All stormwater management controls shall be designed to be within the area shown to be disturbed.

The subject application includes an approved TCP2. The DSP was found to be in conformance with the approved TCP2. Additionally, DPIE indicated that the development has an approved stormwater concept plan. This condition has been met.

- b. **DSP-04008-01 through DSP-04008-03, DSP-04008-06, and DSP-04008-07:** These Planning Director-level approvals involved minor revisions to architecture and signage that do not affect the subject property and this DSP.

10. **2010 Prince George's County Landscape Manual:** The proposed expansion of a church in the R-R Zone is subject to the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* (Landscape Manual) as follows:

- a. **Section 4.2, Requirements for Landscaped Strips Along Streets**—Section 4.2 specifies that, for all nonresidential uses in any zone and for all parking lots, a landscaped strip should be provided on the property abutting all public and private streets. The submitted DSP, with nonresidential uses, has frontage on two public rights-of-way, Brooklyn Bridge Road and Leo James Court, which are subject to this section. The submitted DSP provides the appropriate schedule showing the requirements of this section being met along both frontages.
- b. **Section 4.3, Parking Lot Requirements**—Section 4.3 specifies that any proposed parking lots larger than 7,000 square feet shall provide planting islands throughout the parking lot to reduce the impervious area. The DSP proposes one parking compound that is 25,350 square feet, and provides nine percent interior planting area and eight shade trees in accordance with the requirements of this section.
- c. **Section 4.4, Screening Requirements**—Section 4.4 requires that all dumpsters, loading spaces, and mechanical areas be screened from adjoining existing residential uses, land in any residential zone, and constructed public streets. The subject application proposes only an exterior dumpster location that is proposed to be enclosed with a six-foot-high vinyl fence in accordance with this section. If any loading spaces or ground-level mechanical equipment is proposed in the future, they will have to be screened in accordance with this section.

- d. **Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses**—The subject application requires a Type C bufferyard, including a 40-foot building setback, a 30-foot-wide landscaped yard, and 120 plant units per 100 linear feet along the western and southern property lines because those adjoining uses are single-family detached homes. The required building setback, landscaped yard width, and plant units are provided along both of these property lines; however, some of the labeling on the plan is inconsistent and should be corrected prior to certification. Therefore, a condition has been included in this approval requiring this revision.
 - e. **Section 4.9, Sustainable Landscaping Requirements**—The site is subject to Section 4.9, which requires that a percentage of the proposed plant materials be native plants and that no invasive plants be proposed. The submitted DSP provides the appropriate schedule showing the requirements of this section being met; however, some of the plant numbers in the schedule do not match the plant list. Therefore, a condition has been included in this approval requiring this revision.
11. **Prince George’s County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance:** In comments dated May 2, 2016, the Environmental Planning Section stated that the property under discussion is subject to the environmental regulations of the Zoning Ordinance that came into effect on September 1, 2010 because it has a recently approved PPS and the project is for a new church. There are no previously approved development plans. The property is subject to the provisions of the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance (WCO) because the site has previously approved Tree Conservation Plans, TCPI-067-03 and TCPII-062-05.
- a. **Tree Conservation**—A revised Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan, TCP2-062-05-01, was submitted and reviewed with the subject DSP. The revised TCP2 only covers the portion of the site subject to this DSP. Because no other areas of the overall TCP2 are affected by this revision, the revised sheet, as a revised addendum to the current TCP2, is acceptable.

The revised TCP2 shows a worksheet specific to the overall site. The sheet should be numbered as “5A” to be consistent with the numbering for the current approved TCP2. The TCP worksheet shows an overall requirement of 0.34 acre to be met with 0.13 acre of preservation and 0.28 acre of planting in a landscape buffer. The woodland conservation requirement associated with this DSP has been addressed with the previously approved TCPII. Because no additional clearing has been proposed on the site with this revision and because the woodland conservation requirement has been addressed in other areas of the overall site, no woodland conservation is required to be provided on the subject property. As such, the proposed landscaped areas do not need to be shown as being counted toward the woodland conservation requirement. An updated worksheet for the overall site should be added to the TCP2 sheet. Conditions have been included in this approval requiring the necessary technical revisions to the TCP2.

Although no woodland clearing is proposed, the site plan does propose to remove existing vegetation on the site that significantly contributes to the overall character and viewshed of the road.

- b. **Specimen Trees**—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 site contains three specimen trees shown on the plans as submitted. During the preliminary plan review, information was submitted regarding the health of the three specimen trees located within the limits of the subject application. Evaluation sheets using the Guide to Plant Appraisal prepared by the Council of Tree & Landscape Appraisers and published by the International Society of Arboriculture were submitted. Every effort shall be made to preserve the trees in place, considering the different species’ ability to withstand construction disturbance.

If after careful consideration has been given to the preservation of the specimen trees, there remains a need to remove any of the specimen trees, a variance from Section 25-122(b)(1)(G) is required. Applicants can request a variance from the provisions of Subtitle 25 provided all of the required findings in Section 25-119(d) can be met. An application for a variance must be accompanied by a Letter of Justification stating the reasons for the request and how the request meets each of the required findings.

A variance application and Letter of Justification have been received for the proposed removal of three specimen trees, numbered 1, 2 and 5, shown on the plans stamped as received on February 18, 2016. The site is relatively flat and two of the trees are located near the northern perimeter of the property, adjacent to Brooklyn Bridge Road, as shown on the TCP2.

Specimen Tree 1 is a 35-inch red maple and is located in the interior area of the site. The TCP2 states this tree is in poor condition. Specimen Tree 2 is a 33-inch catalpa located adjacent to Brooklyn Bridge Road. The TCP2 states this tree is in good condition. Specimen Tree 5 is a 35-inch red maple. The TCP2 states this tree is in fair condition.

This site contains an elm species located near the perimeter of the site. Although it is not a specimen tree, it is possible that it could be a county champion tree as there are no listings of this species, *Ulmus glabra*, on the county’s champion tree list. Prior to any grading, it is recommended the applicant consider preserving this tree because it is near the perimeter of the site, and contributes to the viewshed. Every effort should be made to preserve it.

Section 25-119(d) of the WCO contains six required findings to be made before a variance can be granted, as follows:

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

The justification statement states that “there are parking requirements that must be met with the surrounding neighbors to accommodate their wishes regarding the proposed parking.” The letter does not state or provide any detail with regard to the neighbor’s “wishes,” and the location of parking is not considered a special condition of the property.

The site is relatively flat so grading in the area of Specimen Tree 5 can be avoided without significantly compromising the proposed development. On April 15, 2016, Environmental Planning staff visited the site.

Specimen Tree 1 is a red maple located approximately 120 feet deep into the site, within a more developable area. The critical root zone (CRZ) of Specimen Tree 1 is not shown on the plan. Its condition, based on the rating, is poor and the Planning Board agreed that the condition has caused the hardship; therefore, the Planning Board supports the removal of Specimen Tree 1.

Specimen Tree 2 is a southern catalpa and has a condition rating of good; however, upon field inspection of the tree, staff does not agree with this rating. The tree exhibited extreme rotting and dieback was also observed. The CRZ needs to be shown on the plan. The extreme physical condition of Specimen Tree 2 has caused the hardship; therefore, the Planning Board supports the removal of Specimen Tree 2.

Specimen Tree 5 is a red maple and is listed in fair condition. The plan shows that it is located near the northern boundary; however, it appears that the tree was incorrectly located or confused with an existing elm in that area. This tree needs to be survey-located, but it is noted that the tree is still near the northeast perimeter of the site. A CRZ is shown on the plan. Based on what’s shown on the plan, it appears that the primary reason for removing this tree is for landscaping, but also possibly parking with the correct location. A required sidewalk is also shown going through the root zone; however, the sidewalk is incorrectly shown to be within the limits of the property. According to the Transportation Planning Section and the Prince George’s County Department of Public Works and Transportation’s (DPW&T) specifications and standards for roads, the sidewalk is a right-of-way improvement that must be shown within the existing right-of-way for Brooklyn Bridge Road and Leo James Road, not on the subject property and, based on an estimated location, the actual maple is closer to the parking lot. There are no special space or development constraints on the property, with respect to

the proposed development, that may cause the unwarranted hardship, and a review of the plan shows that there is sufficient area to allow the parking to be redesigned without significantly impacting this tree. Therefore, the Planning Board does not support the applicant's request to remove Specimen Tree 5.

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

In the case of Specimen Trees 1 and 2, enforcement of this rule will prevent the applicant from utilizing the developable area of the proposed site and removing a dead tree from the property. However, in the case of Specimen Tree 5, revising the parking will not deprive the application of the use of the property commonly enjoyed by others in similar areas. Adequate parking can still be provided on the site with a design that can also preserve Specimen Tree 5.

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

Specimen Trees 1 and 2 should be removed due to their observed condition and location closer to the developable area of the site. These considerations are not special privileges that would be denied to other applicants.

With regard to Specimen Tree 5, the Planning Board does not generally approve the removal of specimen trees for landscaping, especially if the existing trees can be incorporated into the proposed landscaping, so granting the variance could be construed as a special privilege. Although this tree may possibly be outside of the landscaped area, it is in an area where a small redesign would allow for it to be preserved. Because no topographical or other issues warrant the removal, the Planning Board requires that Specimen Tree 5 be preserved.

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

The physical conditions and circumstances of the locations of Specimen Trees 1 and 2 are not the result of actions by the applicant. However, removal of Specimen Tree 5 is a resultant of actions by the applicant in the design of the landscape area.

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

The request does not arise from a condition related to land or building use on a neighboring property, as all of the specimen trees are located at least 150 feet from any neighboring property.

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

The site has an approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan and (33861-2012-00). The granting of the request will not adversely affect water quality.

The Planning Board found that the required findings of Section 25-119(d) have been adequately addressed for the removal of Specimen Trees 1 and 2, but not Specimen Tree 5. Therefore, conditions have been included in this approval requiring plan revisions to show the preservation of Specimen Tree 5.

12. **Prince George's County Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance:** Subtitle 25, Division 3, the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance, requires a minimum percentage of tree canopy coverage (TCC) on projects that require a building or grading permit for 5,000 square feet or greater of gross floor area or disturbance. Properties that are zoned R-R are required to provide a minimum of 15 percent of the gross tract area to be covered in tree canopy. The subject property is 2.25 acres in size, resulting in a TCC requirement of 0.3375 acre, or approximately 14,702 square feet. A TCC schedule was provided on the DSP showing the requirement being fully met with woodlands preserved on-site. However, the required and provided canopy numbers in the chart are incorrect and should be revised to correctly reflect the 15 percent required, as well as the woodland conservation areas. Therefore, a condition has been included in this approval requiring this revision 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**—There is an existing 2,224-square-foot two-story frame house on the subject property that is more than 50 years old, as well as two sheds to the rear of the house. It appears that the earliest section of the house was constructed about 1903 for Thomas M. Baldwin, Jr., who served as the secretary for the Laurel Building Association. The house at 7015 Brooklyn Bridge Road should be recorded by a Code of Federal Regulations, Title 36, qualified architectural historian on a Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties (MIHP) form. The documentation should include a chain of title, floor plans, and representative interior and exterior photographs. A chain of title can be provided by Historic Preservation staff.

A Phase I archeological survey was previously conducted on the subject property in 2005. One Archeological Site, 18PR793, an early twentieth century artifact scatter, was identified to the east of the house on the subject property. It was determined that Site 18PR793 did not contain significant information and was not eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Therefore, no further work was recommended. Historic Preservation staff concurred that no further work was necessary on Site 18PR793.

The following historic condition is necessary to address this issue:

- (1) Prior to issuance of any demolition or grading permit, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall submit a Maryland Inventory of Historic Property (MIHP) form for the structure located at 7015 Brooklyn Bridge Road to be reviewed and approved by Historic Preservation Section staff. The building shall be documented by a Code of Federal Regulations, Title 36, qualified architectural historian and the submitted documentation shall include a chain of title, floor plans, and representative interior and exterior photos of the buildings.

The condition has been included in this approval.

- b. **Community Planning**—The application is consistent with the *Plan Prince George's 2035 Approved General Plan* policies for established communities and conforms to the institutional land use recommendation for the subject property in the *2010 Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Subregion 1 (Planning Areas 60, 61, 62, and 64)* (Subregion 1 Master Plan and SMA).
- c. **Transportation Planning**—On-site access will be provided from Brooklyn Bridge Road and Leo James Court. This will disperse traffic to two entrances and improve access to the site. Parking and on-site circulation is acceptable. The proposed access point on Brooklyn Bridge Road will have to be approved by the County.

Brooklyn Bridge Road is listed in the Subregion 1 Master Plan and SMA as a primary roadway with 60 feet of right-of-way. Leo James Court, a non-master plan roadway, is shown on the site plan with a 60-foot right-of-way. No structures are planned within the right-of-way of either of these roadways.

Overall, from the standpoint of transportation, the Planning Board determined that this plan is acceptable and meets the finding required for a DSP, as described in Section 27-285 of the Zoning Ordinance.

- d. **Subdivision Review**—The Planning Board reviewed an analysis of the DSP's conformance with the PPS conditions, which is incorporated into Finding 9 above, with conditions of approval, as necessary.

Lot 24, Block A, was the subject of PPS 4-03103, which was approved on January 29, 2004 and recorded in Plat Book NLP 214-88. The PPS approved 30 single-family detached lots and three homeowners parcels. The subject DSP proposes to construct a new church and associated parking on Lot 24, an allowed use in a cluster subdivision pursuant to Section 24-137 of the Subdivision Regulations.

Site Plan Comments:

- (1) Prior to approval of the DSP, the general notes should be revised to:
 - (a) Show the proposed square footage so that the given square footage for each floor equals the summation shown for the total gross floor area.
 - (b) Indicate the tax map/grid as 2-E3.
 - (c) Indicate the WSSC grid reference as 221NE06.
 - (d) Indicate the proposed lot as Parcel 1, consistent with the commercial development naming convention, and label the total area on the lot.
- (2) The DSP shall be revised to clearly show and label the existing and proposed grades and limits of disturbance, each with a different line type.

The site plan comments noted above are technical corrections which should also be made prior to approval of the DSP. If the above comments are addressed, the DSP will be in substantial conformance with the PPS.

The site plan comments have been addressed either through revisions to the plan or conditions of this approval.

- e. **Trails**—The Planning Board reviewed the DSP application for conformance with the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* (MPOT) and other relevant plans in order to implement planned trails, bikeways, and pedestrian improvements. The site is covered by the MPOT and the 2010 *Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Subregion 1* (area plan).

The subject application proposes a 9,880-square-foot 260-seat church on a 2.25-acre parcel. The subject site is in Sustainable Growth Tier 1 and is zoned R-R. The subject site has frontage on Brooklyn Bridge Road and Leo James Court.

There are no sidewalks along Brooklyn Bridge Road or Leo James Court. There are no marked bicycle lanes along Brooklyn Bridge Road, which has a wide shoulder on the north side of the road.

There is one MPOT trail facility in the vicinity of the subject site:

Road	Facility	Limits	Constructed
Brooklyn Bridge Road	Bicycle Lanes	6010 Brooklyn Bridge Road to 8020 Brooklyn Bridge Road	No

Brooklyn Bridge Road is currently an open section road with wide paved shoulders. The necessary 80 feet of right-of-way required by the MPOT has been dedicated along the frontage of the subject site. This right-of-way is sufficient to accommodate the recommended bike lanes. Striping for the designated bike lanes can be considered by DPIE/DPW&T comprehensively for the corridor via a resurfacing project or future Prince George's County Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) project. It is recommended that DPW&T install bikeway signage to alert motorists to the possibility of bicycle traffic.

In addition to the planned pedestrian and bicycle facilities listed, the Complete Streets section of the MPOT includes the following policies regarding multi-modal transportation and the accommodation of pedestrian and bicyclists (page 10):

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.

POLICY 4: Develop bicycle-friendly roadways in conformance with the latest standards and guidelines, including the 1999 AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities.

The subject site does not have sidewalks along either of its road frontages; the submitted site plan does not indicate sidewalks along the subject site's frontage on Brooklyn Bridge Road or on Leo James Court. However, the plans indicate driveway entrances on both streets, which will contribute to the subject site's road frontage improvements. The Planning Board found that sidewalks should be constructed along the entire frontages of Brooklyn Bridge Road and Leo James Court.

The area plan does not have any specific bicyclist and pedestrian recommendations for Brooklyn Bridge Road or Leo James Court within the vicinity of the subject site.

From the standpoint of non-motorized transportation, it is determined that the submitted site plan is acceptable, fulfills the intent of the MPOT, the area plan, and PPS 4-15018, and meets the necessary findings for a DSP as described in Section 27-285 of the Zoning Ordinance if the following condition were to be placed:

- (1) Prior to signature of approval of the Detailed Site Plan (DSP-04008-08), the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall revise the DSP to show the following:

- (a) Standard sidewalks on the subject site's frontage along Brooklyn Bridge Road and Leo James Court, subject to modification by DPIE/DPW&T.

The submitted site plan shows sidewalks along both roadways, but on the property instead of within the right-of-way. Therefore, a condition has been included in this approval requiring the sidewalk to be moved on the site plan.

- f. **Permit Review**—Permit review comments have been addressed through revisions to the plans.
- g. **Environmental Planning**—The Planning Board reviewed the DSP's conformance with the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance, as discussed in Finding 11 above, and the following additional comments:

The project area is 2.25 acres and was previously part of an overall 20.75-acre site in the R-R Zone. The property is identified as Lot 24 and is located on the southwest corner of Brooklyn Bridge Road and Leo James Court. There are streams, wetlands, floodplain, and steep slopes located on the overall site; these comprise the primary management area (PMA). A small portion of PMA is located on the southwestern corner of Lot 24. The predominant soils found to occur, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS), Web Soil Survey (WSS), include the Chillum silt loam, Manor-Brinklow, and Manor loam complexes. According to available information, Marlboro clay and Christiana complexes are not found to occur on this property. According to information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Natural Heritage Program, there are no rare, threatened, or endangered species found to occur on or in the vicinity of this property. No forest interior dwelling species are mapped on-site. The site has frontage on Brooklyn Bridge Road, a master plan designated primary roadway that is not regulated for noise. The site is not located in the vicinity of any mapped scenic or historic roads. According to the 2005 *Approved Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan*, the overall site contains regulated areas, evaluation areas, and network gap areas. Lot 24 contains a network gap area on the southern property boundary.

A signed Natural Resources Inventory Equivalency Letter (NRI-158-14) was submitted with the subject application. The letter was based on a previously approved and partially implemented Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII-062-05) and on a proposed site plan which showed that no on-site regulated environmental features will be impacted.

Brooklyn Bridge Road is designated as a primary roadway and Leo James Road has no designation. Traffic-related noise impact to the proposed use is not an issue of concern because the intended use is nonresidential.

An approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan and Letter (33861-2012-00) were submitted with the subject application. The plan and letter demonstrate the use of permeable pavement for water quality controls and the use of fee-in-lieu of providing on-site attenuation/quality control measures.

- h. **Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department**—The Fire/EMS Department, in a memorandum dated February 1, 2016, 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 a permit.
- i. **Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE)**—In a memorandum dated February 22, 2016, DPIE offered the following summarized comments on the subject application:

 - (1) The property is located on the southwest corner of the intersection of Brooklyn Bridge Road and Leo James Court. Both mentioned roadways are County-maintained; therefore, frontage improvements will be required along both roadways as determined by DPIE and the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T). The necessary rights-of-way exist along both roadways.
 - (2) The proposed Detailed Site Plan is consistent with approved Site Development Concept Plan No. 33861-2012, dated October 31, 2014. Environmental Site Design (ESD) regulations are met through the use of permeable pavement.
 - (3) A site development fine grading permit will be required for the proposed on-site improvements.
 - (4) The proposed entrances into the site are adequate; however, the vegetation along Brooklyn Bridge Road, directly to the east of Leo James Court, must be trimmed in order to provide adequate sight distance from Leo James Court.
 - (5) Additional parking spaces should be provided on-site to prevent street parking on Leo James Court.
 - (6) Existing utilities may require relocation and/or adjustments. Coordination with various utility companies is required.
 - (7) This memorandum incorporates the Site Development Plan Review pertaining to Stormwater Management (County Code 32-182(b)). The following comments are provided pertaining to this approval phase:

 - (a) Final site layout, exact impervious area locations are shown on plans;

- (b) Exact acreage of impervious areas has not been provided;
- (c) Proposed grading is shown on the plans;
- (d) Stormwater volume computations have not been provided;
- (e) Erosion/sediment control plans that contain the construction sequence, and any phasing necessary to limit earth disturbances and impacts to natural resources, and an overlay plan showing the types and locations of ESD devices and erosion and sediment control practices are not included in the submittal;
- (f) A narrative in accordance with the Code has been provided.
- (g) The applicant shall provide items (a-f) at the time of filing final site permits.

Most of DPIE's comments are required to be addressed prior to issuance of permits at the time of technical plan approvals. The DSP needs to be revised to reflect the proposed permeable pavement. The proposed parking shown on the DSP meets the amount required by the Zoning Ordinance.

- j. **Prince George's County Police Department**—The Police Department did not provide comments on the subject application.
- k. **Prince George's County Health Department**—In a memorandum dated March 31, 2016, the Environmental Engineering Program of the Health Department indicated that they had reviewed the subject application and had the following comments and recommendations:
 - (1) The applicant must apply for a Raze Permit from Prince George's County's Department of Permitting, Inspections & Enforcement in order to give assurance of the proper abatement of any asbestos-containing materials in the existing structure.

The applicant is responsible for obtaining the required permits prior to demolition or construction on the subject property.

- (2) The property was built in 1940 and was connected to both public water and sewer in December 25, 1968. The applicant needs to abandon and backfill underground structures such as the septic tank and/or well according to the Code of Maryland Regulations or as witnessed by the approving authority. Contact the Prince George's County Health Department for further guidance.

The applicant is responsible for abandoning and backfilling any septic tanks or wells, in accordance with the appropriate approving authority.

- (3) No construction noise should be allowed to adversely impact activities on adjacent occupied properties. Indicate intent to conform to construction activity noise control requirements as specified in Subtitle 19 of the Prince George's County Code.

This requirement will be enforced at the time of permit; however, a note should be provided on the DSP indicating conformance with these requirements.

- (4) During the construction phases of this project, no dust should be allowed to cross over property lines and impact adjacent occupied 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.

This requirement will be enforced at the time of permit; however, a note should be provided on the DSP indicating conformance with these requirements.

- l. **Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)**—In a memorandum dated February 2, 2016, WSSC offered comments on needed coordination with buried utilities and WSSC easements, and the requirements for connection to the existing water and sewer lines.
 - m. **Verizon**—Verizon did not provide comments on the subject application.
 - n. **Baltimore Gas and Electric (BGE)**—BGE did not provide comments on the subject application.
 - o. **City of Laurel**—The City of Laurel did not provide comments on the subject application.
14. Based upon the foregoing analysis and as required by Section 27-285(b)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance, the subject DSP 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.
 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 DSP 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.**

The Planning Board found that the subject property contains no regulated environmental features that are required to be protected under Section 27-285(b)(4) of the Zoning Ordinance.

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 Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan (TCP2-067-03-01) and further APPROVED Detailed Site Plan DSP-04008-08 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certification, the applicant shall revise the detailed site plan (DSP) as follows or provide the specified documentation:
 - a. Revise the Tree Canopy Coverage schedule to correctly reflect the required and provided tree canopy coverage areas.
 - b. Provide standard sidewalks within the right-of-way of Brooklyn Bridge Road and Leo James Court along the subject site's entire frontage, subject to modification by the Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement or the Department of Public Works and Transportation.
 - c. Provide a plan note to indicate conformance with construction activity dust control requirements as specified in the 2011 Maryland Standards and Specifications for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control.
 - d. Provide a plan note to indicate the applicant's intent to conform to construction activity noise control requirements as specified in Subtitle 19 of the Prince George's County Code.
 - e. Show the proposed square footage so that the given square footage for each floor equals the summation shown for the total gross floor area.
 - f. Revise the site plan to clearly show and label the existing and proposed grades, each with a different line type.
 - g. Indicate the limits of the permeable paving and provide a detail for it on the site plan.
 - h. Clarify the labels and symbols of the existing and proposed plants on the site plan. Verify that the plant totals and types on the site plan match the plant list, the Tree Canopy Coverage schedule, and the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* schedules.
 - i. Reduce the amount of exterior insulation finishing system on all building elevations and replace it with either siding or masonry, up to a minimum of eight feet above grade.
 - j. Revise the access drive off of Leo James Court from 33 feet wide to 18 feet wide and label and sign it as a one-way-in, entrance drive only.

- k. Revise the Type 2 tree conservation plan (TCP2) as follows:
 - (1) Remove the current worksheet and show the worksheet of the previously approved TCP2.
 - (2) Label the TCP2 sheet number as “5A.”
 - (3) Revise the TCP2 to show the existing conditions of the site and identify all structures, driveways, etc. as existing or proposed, whichever is applicable.
- l. Revise the site plan and Type 2 tree conservation plan (TCP2) as follows:
 - (1) Revise the limits of disturbance to preserve Specimen Tree 5 and its associated critical root zone. The TCP2 shall provide details of the necessary protection measures for the tree during construction.
 - (2) Show the critical root zones for Specimen Trees 1 and 2.
 - (3) Revise the specimen tree chart, legend, and symbols on the plan to show Specimen Tree 5 to be retained.
- 2. Prior to issuance of any demolition or grading permit, the applicant and the applicant’s heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall submit a Maryland Inventory of Historic Property (MIHP) form for the structure located at 7015 Brooklyn Bridge Road to be reviewed and approved by the Historic Preservation Section. The building shall be documented by a Code of Federal Regulations, Title 36, qualified architectural historian and the submitted documentation shall include a chain of title, floor plans, and representative interior and exterior photos of the buildings.

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. 16-72
File No. DSP-04008-08
Page 20

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 Bailey, with Commissioners Geraldo, Bailey, and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioners Washington and Shoaff absent at its regular meeting held on Thursday, May 26, 2016, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 23rd day of June 2016.

Patricia Colihan Barney
Executive Director

By Jessica Jones
Planning Board Administrator

PCB:JJ:JK:rpg