

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board is charged with approval of Specific Design Plans pursuant to Part 8, Division 4 of the Zoning Ordinance of the Prince George's County Code; and

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on June 22, 2000, regarding Specific Design Plan SDP-8820/06 for Collington Center, Branch Electric, the Planning Board finds:

1. Location: The subject property is located on the north side of the intersection of Prince George's Boulevard and Commerce Drive. The proposed development is bounded to the north by a developed property, the Prince George's International Commerce Center, and to the west by vacant undeveloped properties, all zoned E-I-A; to the east by the Prince George's Boulevard right-of-way; and to the south by the Commerce Drive right-of-way.
2. The Proposed Development: The purpose of this Specific Design Plan is for the approval of a 38,580 square-foot warehouse addition to an existing warehouse building that also provides office space, and additional parking on the subject property. The subject addition is proposed as warehouse space. The plan includes site, landscape, and architecture plans. The subject property is accessible from both Prince George's Boulevard and Commerce Drive.
3. Background: On March 28, 1989, the District Council approved Zoning Map Amendment Application No.s A-6965, A-9284, and A-9397, Zoning Ordinance No. 25-1989, for Collington Corporate Center, with thirteen (13) conditions and eight (8) considerations. Conditions of approval and considerations embodied in Zoning Ordinance No. 25-1989 that reference specific areas within the Basic Plan boundaries are limited to properties that either have frontage on Central Avenue or Crain Highway. The subject property has frontage on neither thoroughfare, and is separated from both by several intervening properties. The following condition of approval warrants discussion with respect to the subject application.
8. The Declaration of Covenants of Collington Corporate Center prepared as Exhibit 6.1 to the Land Disposition Agreement shall be amended to provide for County representation on the Architectural Review Board until completion of construction of major buildings and improvements on all developable parcels in the Center, and the Covenants shall be recorded in a timely manner following settlement and prior to submittal of any Specific Design Plans. At least one of the County's appointees to the Architectural Review Board shall be a qualified design professional

(urban designer, landscape architect, or registered architect) employed by the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission or the County government. County appointments to the Architectural Review Board shall be made by County Executive nomination and County Council approval.

The Planning Board shall take into consideration design related provisions contained in the covenants during SDP review.

Comment: The applicant has provided written documentation that demonstrates review of the subject plan and architecture by the aforementioned Architectural Review Board. The Architectural Review Board has indicated its approval of the subject proposal, and found compliance with the design related provisions contained in the covenants as demonstrated by the letter (Errico to Warntz) dated March 31, 2000, contained in the staff report back-up.

The Comprehensive Design Plan, CDP-8712, was approved by the Planning Board on May 19, 1988, with three (3) conditions (PGCPB No. 88-224). No specific conditions of approval warrant discussion with respect to the subject application. The noted CDP did specifically address the subject property, and provided guidelines for its development.

As demonstrated by approval of the original Specific Design Plan, SDP-8820, and subsequent revisions for the subject property, conformance to the requirements of both the approved Basic and Comprehensive Design Plans has been met. The current development proposal for this property does not diminish nor alter prior findings of conformance to the Basic and Comprehensive Design Plans.

4. The Approved Preliminary Plat: Preliminary Plat 4-88074 was approved by the Planning Board on June 16, 1988, with eleven (11) conditions (PGCPB No. 88-287). The overall lotting pattern, circulation pattern and access points shown on the site plan are in general conformance with the approved Preliminary Plat 4-88074. As demonstrated by the approval of the original Specific Design Plan, SDP-8820, conformance to the requirements of the approved Preliminary Plat has been met. No specific conditions of approval warrant discussion with respect to the subject application. The Specific Design

Plan is in conformance with the approved Preliminary Plat of Subdivision, 4-88074, and applicable conditions of approval. See Finding No. 9 for additional discussion of Subdivision requirements.

5. The development data for the subject property is as follows:

Zone	E-I-A Zone
Gross Lot Area	22.77 acres
Proposed Use:	Warehouse/Office
Proposed Building Area	168,915 square feet
Number of Parking Spaces Required	122
Number of Parking Spaces Provided	168
Number of Loading Spaces Required	6
Number of Loading Spaces Provided	6
Green Area Required (20%)	4.55 acres
Green Area Provided (75%)	9.83 acres
Interior Landscaping Required (5%)	3,722 sq. ft.
Interior Landscaping Provided (15%)	11,279 sq. ft.

1. Conformance with the Requirements of the Zoning Ordinance in the E-I-A Zone, including the Requirements of the Prince George's Landscape Manual: The Specific Design Plan is in conformance with the regulations governing development in the E-I-A Zone.

Sections 4.2, Commercial and Industrial Landscape Strip Requirements, and 4.3(c), Parking Lot Requirements, Interior Planting, apply to the subject site. The landscape plans are in full conformance with the requirements of the *Landscape Manual*.

7. Environmental Planning: The subject application was referred to the Environmental Planning Section for review, and in a memorandum (Markovich to Jordan) dated April 18, 2000, the following comments were provided:

■ This property is not exempt from the requirements of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance since there are previously approved Type I and Type II Tree Conservation Plans for the whole of the Collington Center.

TCPII/67/96 identified the area of existing woodlands on all the lots and parcels, then assumed a scenario in which all the woodlands on platted lots would be cleared, that area of clearing was then used to determine the replacement requirements for the property. The requirements were then satisfied on the various open space and undeveloped parcels, thus eliminating the need for Woodland Conservation Areas on individual lots. The fact that no WCA~~s~~ are located on lots, does not eliminate the need to evaluate each lot for other environmental features including woodlands that should be protected. No woodlands have been found to occur on this lot according to 1998 aerial photography available in this office.

■No streams, floodplains, wetlands or other significant environmental features have been identified on this property.●

The Specific Design Plan is in conformance with approved TCPII/67/96.

8. Transportation: The subject application was referred to the Transportation Planning Section for review and found to be acceptable in terms of access, circulation, and in conformance with previous conditions of approval with respect to required right-of-way improvements. In a memorandum (Masog to Jordan) dated May 4, 2000, the following comments were provided:

■The finding for a Specific Design Plan requires that the site be served adequately within a reasonable period of time by transportation facilities which are existing, programmed or which will be provided as a part of the development. While the transportation adequacy findings for the subject property are quite old, nothing has occurred which would invalidate them. Therefore, the transportation staff finds that the submitted plans are in conformance with past approved plans. The subject property was the subject of a finding of adequate public facilities made in 1988. Insofar as the basis for that finding is still valid, the transportation staff finds that the subject property will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with transportation facilities which are existing, programmed, or which will be provided as a part of the development if the development is approved.●

9. Subdivision: The subject application was referred to the Subdivision Section for review and in a memorandum (Chellis to Jordan) dated May 2, 2000, the following comments were provided:

■The site plan submitted includes Lot 23 Block ■B● which was recorded in plat book NLP 145@65 in 1989. The site plan also includes a three acre parcel, which is shown by reference as a residue parcel on plat NLP 145@65. Tax Map 77 identifies this acreage parcel as Parcel 66.

■Through the review of the original specific design plan (SDP) file it appears that Parcel 66 was anticipated as being recorded as Lot 24 Block■B●. It appears that the

SDP was approved with a reliance on an unrecorded plat contained in the SDP file that shows Parcel 66 as Lot 24 Block ■B.● That plat was never recorded, instead plat NLP 145@65 was recorded showing the three acres as residue.

■Because Parcel 66 was not recorded as Lot 24 Block ■B.● it is an acreage parcel created as residue through the subdivision process of Lot 23 Block ■B.●, after January 1, 1982. Section 24-107 of the Subdivision Regulations requires a subdivision plat for any plan of development that includes an acreage parcel created after January 1, 1982.

■The site plan currently incorporates Parcel 66 in the overall acreage of the ■lot.● A plat of subdivision for Lot 24 will be required to include Lot 24 as part of the subject site development.●

10. Urban Design: The subject application was reviewed by the Urban Design staff and the following comments are provided with respect to the development proposal:
  - a. The applicant is proposing to provide an addition onto the existing warehouse structure that measures 120-feet-wide by 320-feet-long. The proposed addition will match the existing warehouse in height, exterior finish material, and articulation. The proposed addition will be adjacent to the easternmost part of the existing structure in an open portion of the site which has the most extensive available area for linear extension of the building. Although fairly significant in size, the proposed addition will appear as if it were constructed with the original facility because of the efforts expended to match the height, material, and style of the existing structure. The proposed facades of the addition that will front onto the respective adjacent roadways, Prince Georges Boulevard and Commerce Drive, will be finished in brick with two horizontal bands of accent brick laid vertically to break and provide relief to the expansive mass of the warehouse structure. The opposite facades that will be oriented toward undeveloped lots and open space will be finished with a combination of brick and an insulated metal panel system. The existing office space fronts onto both adjacent roadways. The office exterior is brick with continuous horizontal bands of both glazing and a projected metal awning that wraps around all exposed sides. The height of the office space is approximately 2/3 that of the warehouse, which also is helpful in breaking the mass and scale of the entire facility. Staff believes that the proposed architecture will provide a compatible and complementary treatment to that already in place, and furthermore adequately addresses the prospective views of the facility from the adjacent thoroughfares.
11. Referrals: The subject application was referred to all applicable agencies and divisions; no significant issues were identified. Minor plan revisions were recommended or additional information was requested by the Permit Review Section in a memorandum (Ferrante to Jordan) dated May 8, 2000. Subsequent to the receipt of the noted memorandum the applicant revised the plans to address all concerns and provide the requested information.

12. Adequate provision has been made for draining surface water so that there are no adverse effects on either the subject property or adjacent properties. In a memorandum dated April 25, 2000 (De Guzman to Jordan), the Department of Environmental Resources indicated that the Specific Design Plan is consistent with the DER Stormwater Management Concept approval, #968010950.

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 Specific Design Plan for the above-described land.

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 McNeill, seconded by Commissioner Boone, with Commissioners McNeill, Boone, Brown and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, June 22, 2000, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 13th day of July 2000.

Trudye Morgan Johnson  
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin  
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:JJ:meg