

RESOLUTION

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 June 24, 2004, regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-99027/04 for Sweitzer Lane Property (Lot 4), the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The subject application requests the addition of a 68,000-square-foot office building and accessory parking to the subject site.
2. **Development Data Summary**

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone(s)	I-3	I-3
Use(s)	One 50,000-square-foot office building	The addition of a 68,000-square-foot office building.
Acreage	35.92	35.92
Parcels	0	0
Lots	1	4*
Outparcel	1	2*
Residue	1	0
Building Square Footage/GFA	50,000	118,000

*These numbers derive from Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04027, approved by the Planning Board on June 10, 2004. Such approval is expected to become final by the Planning Board's adoption of a confirming resolution on June 24, 2004.

OTHER DEVELOPMENT DATA

	REQUIRED	PROPOSED
Total parking spaces–Lot 3	128	215
Regular Spaces		
Handicapped spaces	5	8
(counted in regular spaces total above)		
Compact spaces (8.0' x 16.5')	0	70
(counted as "regular spaces")		
Loading spaces	1	9
Total parking spaces–Lot 4	173	241
Regular spaces		

Handicapped spaces (counted in regular spaces total above)	5	12
Compact spaces (counted as “regular spaces”)	0	93
Loading	1	1

3. **Location:** The site is in Planning Area 60, Council District 1. More specifically, it is located at the dead end of Frost Place, approximately 800 feet west of Sweitzer Lane.
4. **Surroundings and Use:** Land use in the general vicinity of the proposed project includes office, public utility uses, and recreation (a ballfield). The land in the subject office park is vacant except for one 50,000-square-foot building.
5. **Previous Approvals:** A conceptual site plan, CSP-99025 (Resolution #99-125), a detailed site plan, DSP-99027 (Resolution #99-126), and a preliminary plan of subdivision, 4-99030 (Resolution #99-126) were all approved for the property on July 22, 1999. TCPI/25/99 was approved with the adoption of CSP-99025 and TCPII/67/69 was approved at certificate approval of DSP-99027. Conceptual site plan CSP-99025/01, approved at staff level on November 15, 2002, facilitated a land exchange between the subject and the adjacent property owned by MD 95 Corp Park. On December 10, 2002, TCPII/67-99-01 was approved to reflect that land exchange. CSP-99025/02 was approved by the Planning Board on April 29, 2004, and Resolution #4-94 formalizing that approval was adopted by the Planning Board on May 20, 2004. Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04027 was approved by the Planning Board on June 10, 2004. A resolution formalizing that approval is expected to be adopted by the Planning Board on June 24, 2004.
6. **Design Features:** The subject 68,000-square-foot office building is proposed to have direct access to Frost Place via a traffic circle, while access to Sweitzer Lane is proposed via a long and narrow travel way along the proposed “Residue of Lot 1.” The proposed building will be the second in the office park; the first, a one-story office building located in the central western portion of the site, offers 50,000 square feet of leasable space. The subject building will be constructed of red EIFS stone and glass. The roofline will be generally flat with some definition most noticeable on the east exterior elevation. The fenestration is banded with several vertical glass areas punctuating the red EIFS and providing visual relief. On-ground parking and landscaping are provided for the subject phase. Landscaping for the subject building includes accent plantings at its entrance and required landscaping for the interior of the parking lot.

The following table provides information on the three other buildings to be constructed as part of future development of the subject office park.

Building	Location	Square Footage	Height/ No. of Stories
Office Building 3	Runs parallel to Frost Place at its terminus	82,000	65/1-6
Office Building 4	Southerly end of the site along the Baltimore Gas and Electric right-of-way	50,000	45/1-4
Parking Deck	Along the southeastern boundary of the subject property	(to be determined)	1-5 levels

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **Zoning Ordinance:** The subject application has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements in the I-3 Zone and the site plan design guidelines of the Zoning Ordinance and with the requirements contained therein regarding the required findings necessary to be made before a variance may be granted.

a. **Conformance with Section 27-471. I-3 (Planned Industrial/Employment Park)**

The subject application is in general conformance with Section 27-471. Office parks are a permitted use in the I-3 Zone (Planned Industrial/Employment Park). Staff offers the following more detailed comments regarding compliance with the subject section:

The proposed project is in conformance with Section 27-471(a) Purposes. Likewise, the proposed project is generally in compliance with Section 27-471(b) Landscaping, Screening and Buffering (see more detailed discussion under “*Landscape Manual*” below). Section 27-471(c) prohibits outdoor storage, which should not be a problem given the proposed office use. Section 27-471(d) requires that both a conceptual and detailed site plan be approved for all uses and improvements on the subject property. Such a conceptual plan has been approved for the project. (Please see Finding 5. Previous Approvals) At time of detailed site plan review, Section 27-471(d) stipulates that landscaping and the design and size of lettering, lighting and all other features of signs proposed will be evaluated. Section 27-471(e) and the Table of Uses (Division 3, Part 7) include professional offices as a permitted use for the subject property. Section 27-471(f), Regulations, citing requirements in Divisions I and 5 of Part 7, the Regulations Tables (Division 4, Part 7), General (Part 2), Off -Street Parking and Loading (Part 12) and the *Landscape Manual* specifically requires that not more than 25 percent of any parking lot and no loading spaces be located in the yard to which the building’s main entrance is oriented, except a 15 percent increase may be approved by the Planning Board in accordance with guidance from the Zoning Ordinance. (See b. below regarding this requirement.) Additionally, Section 27-471(f), as applied to the subject application, prohibits the location of loading docks on any side of a building facing a street. Section 27-471(g) is inapplicable to the subject application as it establishes requirements for warehousing, not an anticipated use on the subject site. Section 27-471(h) reiterates and expounds on the requirements of 27-455.01 (infra.), stating that each planned industrial/employment park shall have frontage on, and direct vehicular access to, a street having a right-of-way width of at least 70 feet. The proposed project meets the requirements

of Section 27-471(i) since the proposed site measures in excess of 25 gross acres.

- b. The applicant has also requested, pursuant to Section 27-239.03, variance from the setback requirement of Section 27-474(b) and a variance from Section 27-471(f)(2) for placing the parking entirely in front of the building.

Per Section 27-230 of the Zoning Ordinance, a variance may only be granted when the Planning Board makes certain findings. Staff has listed each requested variance below with the required findings in bold face below. Staff's comments regarding the required findings for each finding follow in unbolded type.

VARIANCE REQUEST #1 Variance from Section 27-474(b) Table 1, setbacks from adjoining land and non-residential zones for internal lots only for side yards.

- “(1) A specific parcel of land has exceptional narrowness, shallowness, or shape, exceptional topographic conditions, or other extraordinary situations or conditions:”**
- “(2) The strict application of this Subtitle will result in peculiar and unusual practical difficulties to, or exceptional or undue hardship upon, the owner of the property; and”**
- “(3) The variance will not substantially impair the intent, purpose, or integrity of the General Plan or Master Plan.”**

Comment: The specific parcel of land has an exceptionally awkward shape and exceptionally difficult topography, limited by the code-defined Patuxent River Primary Management Areas. Approximately five acres of the site are undevelopable due to the environmental considerations. An adequate public facilities evaluation allows for approximately 250,000 square feet of build-out on the site; however, this build-out cannot be accomplished in one building for marketing purposes and economic reasons and therefore the buildings must be separated on the site to provide the potentially different users varying space options. The need for these future buildings requires several lots as depicted on this site plan. The lot lines cannot be configured to address all of the requirements found in Subtitle 27. The required building setback for the proposed project of 20 feet plus one additional foot for every one foot of building height (55 feet) cannot be met along the north and west property lines. Along the north property line the building setback is approximately 16 feet, and on the west, the building setback is approximately 13 feet, giving rise to a request for variance from the building setback of 39 feet along the northerly property line and 42 feet along the westerly property line. This is due, in fact, to the creation of the lot lines for Lot 4 to accommodate the existing conservation easement and the existing building on Lot 3. Despite the constraints, the building separation between the proposed building and the existing building to the east is over 160 feet. To require the applicant to move the building to the south to accommodate the required setbacks would result in undue and unusual practical difficulties. It would hamper allowed buildout of the site in accordance with the approved conceptual site plan for the subject property. The site is also constrained by the existence of Building #1 on Lot 3 to the east as per the Community Planning Section. The proposed variances will not substantially impair the intent, purpose, or integrity of the General Plan or master plan.

VARIANCE REQUEST #2 Variance from Section 27-471(f)(2) for parking for the I-3 Zone in yard towards which the front of the building is oriented.

- “(1) specific parcel of land has exceptional narrowness, shallowness, or shape, exceptional topographic conditions, or other extraordinary situations or conditions:”**
- “(2) The strict application of this Subtitle will result in peculiar and unusual practical difficulties to, or exceptional or undue hardship upon, the owner of the property; and”**
- “(3) The variance will not substantially impair the intent, purpose, or integrity of the General Plan or Master Plan.”**

Comment: The specific parcel of land has an exceptionally awkward shape and exceptionally difficult topography, limited by the code-defined Patuxent River Primary Management Areas. Approximately five acres of the site are undevelopable due to the environmental considerations. An adequate public facilities evaluation allows for approximately 250,000 square feet of buildout on the site; however, this build-out cannot be accomplished in one building for marketing purposes and economic reasons, and therefore the buildings must be separated on the site to provide the potentially different users varying space options. The need for these future buildings requires several lots as depicted on this site plan. The lot lines cannot be configured to address all of the requirements found in Subtitle 27.

Since the current site configuration does not allow for vehicular circulation to the rear of the building, all parking must be located to its front. However, the Zoning Ordinance stipulates 25 percent as the maximum parking allowed in front of a building, with an increase to 40 percent allowed by discretion of the Planning Board. Therefore, the requested variance would revise the permitted ceiling on the parking in front of the building requirement from 40 to 100 percent. In the case before the Planning Board, whereas the Zoning Ordinance would allow a maximum of 123 spaces in front of the building by right and 197 at the discretion of the Planning Board, the applicant is requesting all proposed 493, or 100 percent, of the parking be located in front of the building. The amount of variance is 60 percent more than what could be permitted at the discretion of the Planning Board and 75 percent more than allowed by right. The building cannot be sited further south because it would interfere with vehicular access to the development from Sweitzer Lane and would block the view of existing building #1. In addition, to require the parking to be located to the rear of the building, in this case, would interfere with vehicular circulation and access to other proposed buildings. The parking, as proposed, will allow open views of the development for easy identification of the buildings as users enter the site from Sweitzer Lane. To require the applicant to move the building to the south to accommodate the required parking to the rear of the building would result in undue and unusual practical difficulties. As per the Community Planning Section, the variance will not substantially impair the intent, purpose, or integrity of the General Plan or master plan.

8. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, 4-99030:** Preliminary Plan 4-99030 was approved by the Planning Board on July 22, 1991, with respect to the subject site.

9. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, 4-04027:** Preliminary Plan 4-04027 was approved by the Planning Board on June 10, 2004. The resolution is scheduled for adoption on June 24, 2004. The Preliminary Plan will be valid through June 24, 2006. Applicant is required to submit Final Plats to the Subdivision Section no later than June 24, 2006. The detailed site plan is in conformance with the approved preliminary plan and its conditions.
10. **Conformance with CSP 99025, 99054, 99054/01 and 99054/02:** Staff has reviewed the requirements of the foregoing conceptual site plan approvals and determined that the subject detailed site plan is in conformance with those requirements.
11. **Landscape Manual:** Section 4.2(b) Commercial and Industrial Landscaped Strip Requirements requires that in the I-3 Zone, the width of the required landscaped strip shall be as shown on a detailed site plan approved by the Planning Board in accordance with Section 27-471(d) of the Zoning Ordinance. The width is, as required in Section 27-474, 30 feet, and the plant materials planted in the strip shall not be less than required by Section 4.2.a.2 of the *Landscape Manual*. Section 4.7 is also applicable to the subject project where it adjoins an unlit ballfield, requiring an “A” buffer in accordance with the requirements of the *Landscape Manual*. Section 4.3 c requires interior planting in the parking area. Applicant has demonstrated conformance with all the relevant sections of the *Landscape Manual*. Staff has reviewed the subject detailed site plan with respect to the above-cited requirements of the *Landscape Manual* and has determined it to be in conformance with those requirements.
12. **Woodland Conservation Ordinance:** This property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George’s County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because the gross tract area is in excess of 40,000 square feet, there are more than 10,000 square feet of existing woodland on-site, and the site has a previously approved TCP. The Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCP/II/67/99-01, has been reviewed. This TCP/II represents a 01 revision to TCP/II/67/99. TCP/II/67/99-01 is in conformance with TCP/II/25/99-01, the latter that was approved by the Planning Board earlier this month.
13. **Referral Comments:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:
 - a. **Community Planning**—The Community Planning Division, in a memorandum dated June 16, 2004, stated that there are no master plan or general plan issues raised through the review of the detailed site plan and variance applications.
 - b. **Transportation?** In a memorandum dated June 14, 2004, the Transportation Planning Section offered the following:

Access to and from the site is acceptable. Off-site traffic adequacy is not an issue in the review of a detailed site plan. There are prior applications that should be considered for consistency, however.

Conceptual Site Plan CSP-99025/02:

This plan was approved with no specific transportation-related conditions. The information on the current plan is consistent with that shown on the conceptual site plan.

Preliminary Plan 4-04027:

Condition 4: This condition requires the bonding and construction of off-site transportation facilities required for adequacy, and is enforceable at the time of building permit. OK for DSP approval.

Condition 5: This condition requires that the applicant provide needed signal warrant studies and signalization at the Sweitzer Lane and Chevy Chase Drive intersection. The studies are to be conducted prior to approval of detailed site plans beyond the subject application. Therefore, this condition becomes enforceable with the next DSP filed. OK.

Condition 6: This condition requires that the applicant provide needed signal warrant studies and signalization at the Sweitzer Lane and Contee Road intersection. The studies are to be conducted prior to approval of major detailed site plans on the site. It appears that this condition becomes enforceable with the subject DSP. To date, no signal warrant studies have been provided. **Therefore, this DSP should not be approved until the required traffic signal warrant study for the Sweitzer Lane/Contee Road intersection is submitted for review.**

Condition 7: This condition sets a trip cap on the site. Between this application and prior detailed site plans, a total of 116,000 square feet of office space would be approved within the site. The entire site is capped at 250,000 square feet of office space; therefore, the subject proposal remains well within the approved trip cap. OK.

Therefore, based on the preceding findings, the Transportation Planning Section recommends **denial of the subject application** until such time that the required traffic signal warrant study for the Sweitzer Lane/Contee Road intersection is submitted for review.

Comment: The concerns of the Transportation Planning Section have been addressed in the recommended conditions below. Specifically, Condition 2.b. requires that prior to signature approval of the plans, the applicant shall supply to staff needed signal studies and signalization if deemed necessary in accordance with the details of Condition 6 of the preliminary plan of subdivision.

- c. **Subdivision** – In a memorandum dated June 9, 2004, the Subdivision Section offered the following:
Preliminary Plan 4-04027 was approved by the Planning Board on June 10, 2004. The resolution is scheduled for adoption on June 24, 2004. The Preliminary Plan will be valid through June 24, 2006. Final Plans must be received by the Subdivision Section no later than June 24, 2006.

The proposed detailed site plan presents a lotting pattern and road configuration generally in conformance with the approved Preliminary Plan. The Preliminary Plan was approved with ten conditions; none of which specifically apply at the detailed site plan stage. However, the following conditions may have some impact on the detailed site plan:

- 2. Development of this subdivision shall be in conformance with an approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/25/99-01). The following note shall be placed on the Final Plat of Subdivision:**

“Development is subject to restrictions shown on the approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/25/99-01), or as modified by the Type II Tree Conservation Plan, and precludes any disturbance or installation of any structure within specific areas. Failure to comply will mean a violation of an approved Tree Conservation Plan and will make the owner subject to mitigation under the Woodland Conservation/Tree Preservation Policy.”

- 6. Prior to the approval of any further detailed site plans on the subject property, the applicant shall submit an acceptable traffic signal warrant study to DPW&T for the intersection of Contee Road and Sweitzer Lane. The applicant shall utilize a new 12-hour count and shall analyze signal warrants under total future traffic as well as existing traffic at the direction of DPW&T. If a signal is deemed warranted by DPW&T at that time, the applicant shall bond the signal prior to the release of any building permits within the subject property and install it at a time when directed by DPW&T. This requirement shall not apply to any minor revision to DSP-99027.**
- 7. Total development within the subject property shall be limited to 250,000 square feet of office development within proposed Lots 3, 4, and 5 that generates no more than 400 AM and 370 PM peak-hour vehicle trips. Any development on Lot 6, other than that identified herein above, shall require a new preliminary plan of subdivision with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities.**
- 8. Development shall be in conformance with the approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan, #8006110-1999-01, or any approved extensions or revisions thereto.**

Comment:

The applicant proposes in this detailed site plan to construct a 68,000-square-foot office building. With the existing 50,000-square-foot building, that would bring development on the property to 118,000 square feet. This is within the cap established by Condition 7. The Transportation Planning Section and the Environmental Planning Section should verify conformance with these conditions. There are no other subdivision issues at this time.

- d. **Trails**—In a memorandum dated June 14, 2004, the Senior Trails Planner stated that there are no master plan trails issues identified in the Adopted and Approved Subregion I Master Plan. The sidewalk along Frost Place is extended onto the subject site's portion of this road. In addition, they noted that the applicant has complied with the requirements of Condition 1c of previously approved DSP-99027 for the property requiring the identification of a handicapped accessible route from the street to the building.
- e. **Permits**—In a memorandum dated June 14, 2004, the Permit Review Section offered the following:
- (1) The general notes show a requirement of five loading spaces for the entire site; however only two loading spaces are required. The general note should be revised to show a total of two loading spaces required for the entire site.
 - (2) The general notes show a total of 215 parking spaces on Lot 3 and a total of 241 parking spaces on Lot 4 for a total of 456 parking spaces for the entire site. However, the total number of parking provided for the entire site is shown at 415 parking spaces. The amount of parking provided should agree throughout the site plan.
 - (3) Per Section 4.3(c) of the Landscape Manual, at least one shade tree shall be provided for every 300 square feet of interior landscaped area PROVIDED. A total of 40 shade trees are required for 11,977 square feet of interior landscaped area provided.

The Permit Review Section's comments are reflected in recommended conditions 1 (a) to (c) below.

- f. **Environmental Planning**—The Environmental Planning Section in a memorandum dated June 14, 2004, offered the following comments on the proposed project:
- (1) The Detailed Forest Stand Delineation submitted with application CSP-99025/02 was found to be in compliance with the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Technical Manual and Policy Document.

Comment: No further information is necessary in relation to the FSD.

- (2) This 35.92-acre property in the I-3 zone has a net tract area of 35.42 acres and a Woodland Conservation Threshold of 15 percent or 5.31 acres. The site contains 27.60 acres of existing woodland, of which 0.50 acres is in the floodplain. The current TCPII shows the amount of woodland to be cleared at 18.07 acres. The woodland conservation requirement is 9.83 acres and this will be met on-site with 7.53 acres of woodland preservation. No reforestation is proposed in vicinity of Lot

4 and the scope of the subject review. However, other areas of the overall scope of TCPI/25/99-01 do include reforestation.

There are several deficiencies associated with the TCPII and it must be revised. The site is located in the Bear Branch watershed of the Patuxent River basin. The current TCPII does not accurately show the Patuxent River Primary Management Area (PMA) delineation line in the vicinity of the existing storm drain outfall northeast of the existing one story building. The PMA delineation line (or boundary) should be drawn across the storm drain easement area to include all of it, because the location of the PMA does not change even though impacts to the PMA are proposed or have been previously approved.

One of the five standard TCPII notes has not been provided. Revise the standard TCPII notes to include standard Note #5...to address the proposed off-site mitigation. The building is located on the lot 20 feet from the proposed woodland conservation area. The building should have at a minimum 30 feet from its edge and the proposed limits of disturbance to allow adequate room for grading and construction activity for the building. The Tree Protection Device (TPD) detail is not on the plan. Provide the TPD detail...on the plan and include a note as to when the TPDs will be removed (i.e., TPDs shall remain in place as found on the TCPII until the completion of all construction activity with the associate building on Lot 4). Edge management notes have not been provided on the plan to address how damage to the root systems will be minimized. Provide the Edge Management notes to include the section labeled "Removal of Hazardous Trees or Hazardous Limbs by Developers or Builders;" and the two notes under "Woodland Areas NOT Counted as Part of the Woodland Conservation Requirements." After these revisions have been made, have the qualified professional who prepared the plan sign and date it and include their business and e-mail addresses and phone number.

Comment: These concerns of the Environmental Planning Section have been addressed in the recommended conditions below.

- (3) In review of DSP-99027/04 with TCPII/67/99-01 there is one discrepancy associated with the former plan. On DSP-99027/04, the PMA is shown in the original location prior to a soils investigation having been performed before the submittal of Preliminary Plan 4-04027. As a result of the soils investigation, it was determined that the edge of steep slopes are further north by approximately 20 feet, or as shown on TCPII/67/99-01. Therefore, DSP-99027/04 must be revised to show the adjusted location of the PMA as it is shown on TCPII/67/99-01.

Comment: This concern of the Environmental Planning Section has been addressed in the Recommended Conditions below.

- g. **Department of Environmental Resources**—At the time of the writing of this staff report,

the Department of Environmental Resources has not offered comment on the proposed project.

- h. **Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department**—In a memorandum received June 16, 2004, the Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department offered comment on the proposed project regarding required access to be provided to the site. In addition, they have offered information regarding fire hydrant placement and road requirements.
 - i. **Department of Public Works and Transportation**—The Department of Public Works and Transportation, in a memorandum dated June 16, 2004, has offered comments regarding required frontage improvements and right-of-way dedication, noting that a review of the traffic impact study would determine the adequacy of access points and the need for acceleration/deceleration and turning lanes.
 - j. **Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission**—In a memorandum dated June 15, 2004, the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission noted that a water and sewer extension may be required and that an on-site plan review package should be submitted. Further, they stated that the project engineer should request a waiver to allow shared on-site systems since site parking is shared or an on-site takeover may be required.
 - k. **Maryland State Highway Administration**—At the time of the writing of this staff report, the Maryland State Highway Administration has not offered comment on the proposed project.
12. As required by Section 27-285(b) of the Zoning Ordinance, the detailed site plan represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines of Subtitle 27, Part 3, Division 9 of the Prince George's County Code without requiring unreasonable cost and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

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 II Tree Conservation Plan (TCP/II/67/99-01) and further APPROVED Detailed Site Plan DSP-99027/04 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Prior to signature approval of the detailed site plan, the applicant shall revise the plans as follow:
 - a. The applicant shall revise the general notes to indicate that only two loading spaces are required for the entire site.
 - b. The applicant shall revise the plans so that mention of the number of total parking spaces provided for the project is consistent throughout the plans.
 - c. Schedule 4.3 included on the Landscape plan shall be revised to show a total of 40 shade

trees provided for interior parking lot landscaped area.

- d. The detailed site plan shall be revised to show the adjusted location of the PMA as it is shown on the TCPII/67/99-01.
2. Prior to signature approval, applicant shall provide to staff as designee of the Planning Board:
 - a. Satisfactory evidence from the Department of Environmental Resources that the proposed project is in conformance with approved Stormwater Concept Plan 8006110-1999-01 or any approved extensions or revisions thereto.
 3. Prior to signature approval, the TCP II shall be revised to address the following:
 - a. Revise the location of the PMA boundary to be shown across the existing storm drain easement.
 - b. Revise the standard TCPII notes to include standard Note #5 to address the proposed off-site mitigation.
 - c. Along the northeast boundary of the proposed building, the limits of disturbance shall be 15 feet from the building, and around all other areas a minimum of 30 feet of disturbed area shall be provided a concrete anchored, in ground, six-foot high chain link fence shall be installed along the limits of disturbance in the area of the 15-foot-wide disturbed area. This fence may be removed after all construction activities are complete.
 - d. Provide the Tree Protection Device detail on the plan and include a note as to when the Tree Protection Device will be removed (i.e., Tree Protection Devices shall remain in place as found on the TCPII until the completion of all construction activity with the associate building on Lot 4).
 - e. Provide the Edge Management notes to include the section labeled "Removal of Hazardous Trees or Hazardous Limbs by Developers or Builders;" and the two notes under "Woodland Areas NOT Counted as Part of the Woodland Conservation Requirements."
 - f. After these revisions have been made, the applicant shall have the qualified professional who prepared the plan sign and date it and include their business and e-mail addresses and phone number.
 4. Any required signal warrant studies or signalization in the vicinity of the subject project shall be completed in accordance with the requirements of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04027.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that an appeal of the Planning Board's action must be filed with the District Council of Prince Georges 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 Squire, seconded by Commissioner Harley, with Commissioners Squire, Harley, Vaughns Eley and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, June 24, 2003, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 24th day of June 2004.

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:RG:meg