

R E S O L U T I O N

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

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on March 8, 2001, regarding Detailed Site Plan SP-00053 for Brandywine 301 Industrial Park, Parcel 7, Block B, the Planning Board finds:

1. The subject site (Parcel 7, Block B) in the I-1 (Light Industrial) Zone, consisting of approximately 19.53 acres, is located on the west side of Matapeake Drive, northeast of the intersection of Cedarville Road and US 301. The proposed use, trailer storage, is a permitted use in the I-1 Zone. Access to the property is from Matapeake Drive. The existing uses on the adjacent properties are as follows:

North - zoned I-1, future access road for adjacent I-1 zoned lot
South - zoned I-1, vacant
East - Matapeake Drive
West - zoned I-3, Long's Subdivision, Single-family detached residential and Brandywine Road
2. Detailed Site Plan SP-00053 was submitted in accordance with the requirements of Condition #19 of the Preliminary Plat 4-97124 approved by the Planning Board on April 16, 1998 (PGCPB No. 98-84).

Condition #19 states that:

■Prior to approval of grading and/or building permit for each lot in the I-1 Zone, a limited Detailed Site Plan for each lot shall be approved by the Planning Board to determine compliance with the conditions of the approved rezoning application (A-9502-C) and carried through in the Subregion V Master Plan.●

The conditions of the Zoning Map Amendment are listed in Finding #4 of Preliminary Plat 4-97124:

■Zoning Map Amendment A-9502-C was approved in 1985 reclassifying the I-1 zoned portion of this property (and other adjacent property) from the E-I-A Zone to the I-1 Zone. In 1993, the Master Plan for Subregion V was approved recommending the property for ♦employment♦land use; generally the ♦employment♦land use category corresponds to industrial land uses. Accordingly, the 1993 Subregion V Sectional Map Amendment retained the I-

1 and I-3 Zones on the property, including the conditions applied at the original Zoning Map Amendment. Conditions 1 and 3 are applicable to this part of the subject property:

- a. No corrugated metal or cinder block structure shall be visible from either US 301 or Cedarville Road.**
 - b. The initial 25 feet along the entrance road to the subject property shall be landscaped and planted with trees.**
- A limited detailed site plan review was required as a condition of approval of the previous preliminary plat application on this property to ensure compliance with these conditions. The detailed site plan review requirement is carried through in this application for the same reasons.●**

There are no corrugated metal or cinder block structures proposed on this property. The trailer storage area will be screened from Matapeake Drive by the proposed landscaping and the recommended fence. US 301 is parallel to Matapeake Drive and the subject site will be completely screened from US 301 by the various lots in between Matapeake Drive and US 301 and the proposed landscaping on the subject site. The applicant has provided a 10-foot-wide landscape strip along Matapeake Drive according to the requirements of the *Landscape Manual*.

3. The trailer storage is proposed on gravel paving in the southern portion of the site. Approximately 3.88 acres of land in the northwestern portion of the property is delineated as wetland area. A stormwater management pond is proposed in the southeast corner of the property. A 1652-sq.ft. office and associated parking are proposed in the northeast corner of the property. Brandywine Road dead ends on the western property line. There is no access to the property from Brandywine Road.
4. Section 27-469, I-1 Zone (Light Industrial), of the Zoning Ordinance establishes the following parameters for landscaping, screening and buffering of development in the I-1 Zone:

- (1) At least ten percent (10%) of the net lot area shall be maintained as green area.

The applicant has provided 5.7 acres or 30.5% of green area.

- (2) Any landscaped strip adjacent to a public right-of-way required pursuant to the provisions of the Landscape Manual shall not be considered part of the required green area.

The landscaping proposed along the public right-of-way will not be considered a part of the required green area.

5. The proposal is subject to the requirements of Section 4.2 (Commercial and Industrial Landscape Strip) and Section 4.7 (Buffering Incompatible Uses) of the *Landscape Manual*. The proposed landscaping complies with the requirements of the *Landscape Manual*.

Section 27-469(c)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance provides the following requirement for all development in the I-1 Zone:

■Outdoor storage shall not be visible from the street.■

The existing and proposed landscaping is not adequate to completely screen the trailer storage on the subject property from the streets. A six-foot-high sight-tight fence in addition to the proposed landscaping will be appropriate to completely screen the property.

The proposed fence should be weather resistant and low maintenance. In order to maintain an attractive appearance along the streets, the fence should be proposed behind the existing and proposed landscaping. A condition of approval has been added to require the recommended fence behind the proposed landscaping along Matapeake Road on the north side of the proposed stormwater management pond. A condition of approval has been added to require the same.

Referral Comments

6. The Permits Review Section (Gallagher to Srinivas, February 26, 2001) has stated that the proposal must comply with the conditions of the Zoning Map Amendment A-9502 and Preliminary Plat 4-97124. Minor changes are requested to the site/landscape plans. A condition of approval has been added to require the same.
7. The Transportation Planning Section (Masog to Srinivas, February 22, 2001) has stated that the proposal does not exceed the trip cap imposed by Condition #11 of the Preliminary Plat 4-97124. The 1652-sq.ft. office building will be subject to a pro-rata payment at the time of building permit in accordance with Condition #10 of the Preliminary Plat 4-97124. The location of Parcel I is not consistent with the location shown on the approved Preliminary Plat. The purpose of Parcel I was to provide access to Lots 4 to 23 of the Long~~as~~ Subdivision. The altered location of Parcel I does not show access to these lots. Therefore, the Section originally made a finding that the site plan is not a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines. However, since the Final Plat is being prepared that will comply with the intent of Condition #18 (relates to the connection of Long~~as~~ Subdivision properties to Matapeake Drive), the site plan is acceptable. Finding 9 below states that the Subdivision Section has made a determination of substantial conformance of the subject Detailed Site Plan with the approved Preliminary Plat.
8. The Subdivision Section (Chellis to Srinivas, February 14, 2001) has stated that there are minor discrepancies between the site plan and the approved preliminary plat lotting pattern

for 4-97124. However, the Subdivision Section has made a determination of substantial conformance to the approved Preliminary Plat. The Section has stated that conformance with the conditions #5, #11 and #22 of approval for the Preliminary Plat must be determined by the Transportation Planning Section and the Environmental Planning Section. Finding 8 and 11 address these issues.

9. The Department of Public Works and Transportation (Sanjalia to Srinivas, January 19, 2001) has stated that the road improvements along Matapeake Drive must comply with the conditions of approval for Preliminary Plat 4-97124. State Highway Administration (McDonald to Srinivas, October 26, 2000) has no comments regarding the proposal.
10. The Environmental Planning Section (Markovich to Srinivas, January 23, 2001) stated that there are no significant environmental concerns regarding this application. The proposal is consistent with the approved Tree Conservation Plans TCPI/26/91 and TCPII/133/91. There are no impacts to existing wetlands due to this proposal. No additional information regarding existing soils is required at this time but the Department of Environmental Resources may require a soils report during the technical review of the stormwater management ponds. The Section has stated that the applicant should revise the landscape plans to reflect the location and type of all woodland conservation areas, location of tree protection devices and location of woodland conservation signs.
11. The Community Planning Division (Rovelstad to Srinivas, February 1, 2001) has stated that the approved Master Plan supports the proposed use. However, some concerns regarding adequate screening of the proposed use on the site have been expressed. With the proposed conditions, the subject site will be adequately screened as required by the Master Plan recommendations.
12. The Department of Environmental Resources (De Guzman to Srinivas, January 25, 2001) has stated that the proposal is consistent with the stormwater management concept plan #8328334-2000.
13. With the proposed conditions, the Detailed Site Plan SP-00053 is found to represent a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines without requiring unreasonable costs 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 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certification of the Detailed Site Plan, the site/landscape plans shall be revised to show the following:
 - a. a six-foot-high sight-tight fence behind the landscape strip along Matapeake Road on the north side of the proposed stormwater management pond
 - b. the location of woodland conservation signs.

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 Brown, seconded by Commissioner Lowe, with Commissioners Brown, Lowe, Eley and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, March 8, 2001, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 29th day of March 2001.

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:LS:rmk